

THE CLERGY REVIEW

QUID RETRIBUAM?

BY ARNOLD LUNN.

"**T**HAT'S all very interesting," said the naval officer, "but has Catholicism made you any *happier*? That's the point. That's what I want to know."

"But is that the point?" I asked. "Supposing one of your junior officers came to you and told you that he had discovered a new formula for hitting a moving target at sea. Would you ask him if this formula had made him any happier, or would you ask him whether, in point of fact, the formula enabled him to hit the target? Surely the thing that matters about Catholicism is not whether it makes Lunn happy but whether it hits the target. Happiness is not necessarily a test of truth. Indeed, the realization that Catholicism was true might make a man very unhappy if the discrepancy between his own behaviour and the Catholic code was too glaring."

My naval friend's question was symptomatic. In this subjective age we are losing all sense of objective truth. "Objective truth," as my friend Mr. Joad remarks, "being regarded as unobtainable, what alone is thought interesting are the reasons which lead people to formulate their particular brand of error." Mr. Joad might have added that the modern tends to assess creeds solely by the degree of pleasure which they afford to those who embrace them.

I had intended to confine myself in my own apologia strictly to the objective arguments for the faith, and I should have justified this course by insisting that the question at issue was the truth of Catholicism and not the reactions of Arnold Lunn to Catholic truth. Mr. Sheed, however, dissented with horror from this ingenuous suggestion, and in consequence of his moving remonstrances I dashed off the first part of *Now I See*

in a fortnight. I have now come to the regretful conclusion that Mr. Sheed was right. Moreover, I suspect that those who are hesitating on the threshold of the Church will be far less interested in impersonal arguments than in the personal experiences of those who have already taken this step. Like my friend they will want to know whether Catholicism adds to the happiness of life.

I do not suppose that any near-Catholic would be deterred from the decisive step by the dying myth that born Catholics dislike and are unpleasant to converts. There is a certain amount of good-humoured banter on the subject, but nothing more. The only incident in my experience which suggested something stronger than a very natural prejudice against the "new boy" is perhaps worth recording for its humour.

A Catholic doctor who lives a few miles from my home, and who had read some of my articles on evolution, rang me up and asked me if I would come round and have a talk, as he had some suggestions to make which I might find useful. I accepted his invitation, and then he added, in a hesitating voice, "Would you mind going straight to my study, and if you meet my wife or children in the passage, I should be so grateful if you would pretend to be a patient? They can't stand converts, particularly those who write."

But such incidents have no bearing on my naval friend's question: "Has Catholicism made you any happier?"

I might have replied to his question by expatiating on the inexhaustible riches of Catholicism as a life-study, for Catholicism is a leaven which has permeated all aspects of life, artistic, economic and political, no less than religious; but my friend was thinking less of the pleasures of the mind than of the happiness of the soul. He wanted to know whether I had found peace.

Now peace-finding has never been one of my major preoccupations, which is perhaps just as well, for the Church does not guarantee serene untroubled faith to the convert. Far from it. Temptations against the faith recur and are indeed, as Abbot Chapman pointed out,¹

¹ *The Spiritual Letters of Dom John Chapman, O.S.B.*, page 47. Sheed & Ward.

peculiarly characteristic of this age.

"In the seventeenth to eighteenth centuries," he wrote, "most pious souls seem to have gone through a period in which they felt sure that God had reprobated them (for example, the nuns to whom Père de Caussade wrote his wonderful letters). This doesn't seem to happen nowadays.

"But the *corresponding trial* of our contemporaries seems to be the *feeling of not having any faith*; not temptations against any particular article (usually), but a mere feeling that religion is not true. It is an admirable purgative, just as the eighteenth century one was; it takes all pleasure out of spiritual exercises, and strips the soul naked. It is very unpleasant. But the 'Night of the Spirit' is not pleasant in any of its many forms. The only remedy is to *despise* the whole thing, and pay no attention to it—except (of course) to assure Our Lord that one is ready to suffer from it as long as He wishes, which seems an absurd paradox to say to a Person one doesn't believe in! But, then, that is the trial. Faith is really particularly strong all the time."

My own experience is that these moods of depression and disquietude coincide with ill-health. A window pane encrusted with dirt keeps off the light, and a disordered body may intercept the light of faith. If religion were an opiate to which we turned in times of gloom, our faith would be weakest when our health was at its best, but this does not seem to be the normal experience.

A friend of mine was once expatiating on the marvellous results achieved by a doctor who had been injecting thyroid gland into his patients.

"A woman went to him," he said, "because she was no longer able to love her husband. He injected thyroid, and her power of love was restored. Unfortunately, it was not her husband who benefited by this change.

"A priest who had lost his faith went to him. He injected thyroid, and the priest got back his faith."

All of which might be used equally plausibly as an argument for or against materialism. Again, the fact that the periods of uneasiness in the experience of most converts recur at longer intervals, and that faith grows stronger as the years pass, tells neither for nor against Catholicism. If Catholicism be true, one would expect

to find its truth more and more apparent with the passing of time. If religion be a form of auto-suggestion, we should expect that the critical faculty of the religious drug-fiend would progressively weaken. The logical Freudian, if such a phrase be not a contradiction in terms, would infer that religious experience, if consistent with the Freudian thesis, is certainly no less consistent with the religious thesis, and would deduce that the champions and critics of religion would be well advised to concentrate on the objective arguments for and against any particular religious creed. But this is, of course, precisely what the Freudian refuses to do. You may search Freudian literature in vain for any critical examination of the arguments for the existence of God or the Resurrection of Jesus Christ. Christians, on the other hand, have critically examined Freudianism, and have concentrated on refuting Freudianism rather than on psycho-analysing Freud.²

As I have elsewhere given at some length my reasons for accepting Catholicism, my concern at the moment is not to argue but merely to answer my friend's question, and my answer to that question is that I have known since I became a Catholic moments of depression and also moments of happiness far exceeding any happiness which I had experienced before I became a Catholic.

" Ah, did you once see Shelley plain,
And did he stop and speak to you,
And did you speak to him again?
How strange it seems, and new."

The moments when one sees beauty plain are sandwiched in between long tracts when one walks not by sight but by faith. This, indeed, is the meaning of one of the most beautiful passages in *The Path to Rome*.

" All the village sang knowing the psalms very well, and I noticed that their Latin was nearer German than French; but what was most pleasing of all was to hear from all the men and women together that very noble good night and salutation to God which begins :

" ' Te Lucis ante terminum.'

" My whole mind was taken up and transfigured by

² See pages 245 and 275 of the second edition of *The Flight from Reason*.

this collective act, and I saw for a moment the Catholic Church quite plain, and I remembered Europe and the centuries. Then there left me altogether that attitude of difficulty and combat which, for us others, is always associated with the Faith. The cities dwindled in my imagination and I took less heed of the modern noise. I went out with them into the clear evening and the cool. I found my cigar and lit it again, and musing much more deeply than before, not without tears, I considered the nature of Belief."

These moments of certitude may also be provoked by a chance encounter with a near-saint. I remember exchanging a few words with a nun whose face mirrored the beauty which informed her life, and when I left her it seemed the most natural thing in the world that I should go straight into a neighbouring chapel and recite the *De Profundis* with a shattering conviction which was as different from my more profunctory *confiteors* as her faith was from mine.

Other and more agreeable moments of spiritual certitude may coincide, as described in the passage just quoted, with Catholic acts of worship. My own liturgical side is weakly developed, and I do not think that I have been to High Mass more than a dozen times in my life. Even as a Catholic I still retain that queer prejudice inspired by the uneasy conviction that I am watching a spectacle rather than assisting in an act of worship.

But Our Lady of Paris put me right on this point.

There are moments when different arts seem like notes combining to form one chord. No chord could be more beautiful than that of which the notes are the architecture, art and music of Notre Dame. I remember one long drawn note which seemed to follow the lines of the Gothic vaulting and resolve into the incomparable glory of the great north window.

"Such gifts are allowed to man

That out of three sounds he frame not a fourth sound
but a star!"

I have been back to Notre Dame since then, and High Mass was still beautiful and enriched with a new significance. But there was no star. No man, as Heraclitus somewhere says, goes into the same stream twice.

Experiences such as these are convincing to the experient, to borrow a useful word coined by my friend, Dr. Rattenbury, but they have little or no apologetic value for other people. No useful discussion is possible, says St. Thomas Aquinas, unless both parties to the debate start from the same premise. This statement was considered a truism in the thirteenth century, but sounds like a paradox at a time when Modernists, Marxists, Buchmanites and popular scientists all appeal with the same conviction to their own peculiar brand of inner light.

I do not deny that a valid argument may be based on the highest common factor, the factor common to the religious experience of all the great saints and mystics.³ Nor do I suggest that a personal experience is unimportant because it is convincing only to the person concerned. No conversion is more important to a man than his own, and though only one man knew for certain that Christ had appeared on the Damascus Road, that appearance was decisive to the man in question. Those of us who try to discriminate between the importance of religious experience to the experient and its apologetic value to those who have not shared the experience in question, are often accused of exaggerating the value of dialectic. But the fact that a man is reluctant to argue from his own feelings does not mean that he has no feelings from which to argue. He may be hindered by invincible shyness from wandering beyond the frontiers of unemotional fact. He may dread the fate of those

“ who mar their mortal melodies
with broken stammer of the skies.”

Broken stammer is unconvincing, but I have often wished that I could reinforce the impersonal arguments for the Faith by a convincing description of all that it means to emerge from the gloom of scepticism into the sunshine of the Faith.

Only a poet could do justice to this theme, but I who am only a controversialist must be at least allowed to say “Thank you.” Among the moments for which I am most grateful is one which I shall always associate with my first Easter as a Catholic.

³ And I have elsewhere tried to state what may be described as “the Argument from Corporate Experience.”

A few months after I had been received I spent Palm Sunday at Sestrières, the famous ski-ing centre in the Italian Alps. The congregation had struggled along a trench between walls of snow six feet in height into a little church decorated with disconsolate palms which remembered the Eastern sun. I decided to spend Easter Sunday at some lower level where it would not be necessary to consult the calendar in order to convince myself that April had arrived.

I have spent many winters among the mountains, and for me Easter will always be associated with the feet that are beautiful upon the mountains for the good tidings that they bring of Resurrection. In Mürren, where I lived continuously for two years, the first snows often come in October, and the ground is sometimes white until the end of April. In the lowlands, winter gives place without a struggle to spring, and the few sparse snowfalls are only a memory when the buds begin to burgeon. But there is no such gradualness about the Alpine spring. Winter puts up a desperate resistance, and every yard of advance is sternly contested. The premature jubilation of a meadow gay with crocus and anemone may be turned into mourning by a sudden smother of snow. The destructive avalanche is no less characteristic of spring than the tender soldanella. Spring in the lowlands is a lyric, in the Alps an epic.

If you have seen the autumn snows silver the gold of deciduous foliage, and watched the grip of winter tightening on the land, you will welcome the spring with a more heartfelt *Te Deum* than is ever inspired by the gracious charms of April among the plains.

The most perfect ski-ing cannot reconcile you indefinitely to a monotone of blue and white, and to the lifeless silence of the Alpine winter. The valley river, muted by the frost, creeps among the stones, a poor dispirited, listless thing,

“ The languid springs do scarcely move,
The sound is forced, the notes are few.”

And then one morning one awakens suddenly to the friendly chirrup of a bird, and from far below comes the unmistakable adorable sound of a river which is finding her voice again, and trying over a few tentative notes before tuning up for the spring. The tide has

turned, and day by day the sun climbs a little higher, begins to strip the snow off the steeper southern slopes, and to pick out a few splashes of fresh young green on the low-lying meadows. The first of the flowers thrust themselves through the frozen earth.

Just as one is beginning to hope that the winter has given up the unequal struggle, one awakens to a scurry of falling snow, and for days the snow continues. Not easily is spring delivered from the womb of winter, but the splendour of that longed-for deliverance lends a unique significance to the mountain spring. It is not only for the Resurrection of Our Lord that the mountain peasant gives thanks at Easter, but for the resurrection of warmth and colour from the tomb of snow.

On my way to Orta I found myself with an hour to spare at a wayside town. I went along to the church to discover if I could make my Easter confession and found an obliging priest. After sampling my Italian, he asked me if I could speak French. I replied in the affirmative, and then wondered whether I ought to include this mis-statement in the list of sins to be confessed. But his French was no better than my own. He concluded by an odd question: What penances was I accustomed to get in England? I answered: "Oh, trois Ave Maria"; to which he replied: "Alors, un suffit." Charmed by this attractive specimen of the genial Catholicism of the South, I emerged into the April sunshine, and slept that night at Orta.

The next morning I heard Mass in a little hill chapel overlooking the lake. I came out just before the last prayers to link the Easter Mass with the Easter loveliness of the lake. The mountain wind was weaving delicate patterns on the water and the lake darkened where the wind touched it. The north hills were still white, but the slopes which fell away from the terrace and which faced the sun were blue with gentians, and I saw quite plain that the visible beauty of the hills which I had loved as a boy was linked by a kind of necessary connection with the invisible beauty which I had discovered as a man. And the words of the Mass rose to my lips:

QUID RETRIBUAM DOMINO PRO OMNIBUS QUAE RETRIBUIT MIHI?

NENDRUM

BY ALICE CURTAYNE.

I HESITATE to write of this place, ruin of one of the earliest Celtic Monasteries in Ireland, and perhaps the most interesting focus of pilgrimage in the whole of these islands. It deserves to be widely known but, happily for its spacious quietude, it is hardly known at all. I have never visited a site more vividly peopled with venerable figures out of the past, or a landscape on which a wonderful story is engraved in characters so plain to read. But the popularizing of Nendrum would be so much akin to its profanation that I would not thus endanger it by discussion, were it not that its remoteness from the highways of men is already a sufficient safeguard of its spirit.

To go to Nendrum is to travel nobly. Why, then, hesitate to tell of it and share that which has been an exalted experience? Because this place is for the few. The pilgrim to Nendrum must be not only fully informed of its story, but personally attracted, too, in his soul. Such travellers are rare and Nendrum would serve no others.

Belfast is the point from which to reach it. This city cannot be avoided, in fact, because the Nendrum finds are housed in it, and the finds must be examined if you are to understand Nendrum. Since man lives by contrast, it is good to start from Belfast. The murky atmosphere of the modern industrial city—murky spiritually and with material smoke—will but show up in brighter tones the sunlight of early Christian Ireland evoked in Nendrum. In Belfast there is noise, commercial activity, ruthless competition, blatant paganism; in Nendrum there is majestic silence that seems to rebuke such petty striving, there is peace and the beneficent influence of hallowed memories.

The ruins stand on Island Mahee, in Strangford Lough, Co. Down, sixteen miles from Belfast, or seven miles south-east of Comber village. I reached my goal by travelling by 'bus from Belfast to Comber, and then walking the seven miles from Comber. It is not a highly interesting road, enlivened as it is by very infrequent

glimpses of the Lough. It might be a dull road to a man without any interior resources. I beguiled its monotony by studying a map of the ruins which I had traced from Mr. Lawlor's excellent book on the subject.¹ I had time, on the long road, to study the tracing in such detail that, when at last my eyes rested on the Island, they were greeted with outlines that had already become familiar to my mind.

Island Mahee is not, strictly speaking, an island, because it is linked to the mainland by two causeways and by a macadamized road. The greater part of it, however, is still laved by the waters of Strangford Lough, so that the geographical conditions of antiquity can be reconstructed without effort. (The word "Mahee" is a corruption of "Mochaoi," and it is pronounced as though spelled "Mughee," with the second syllable accented.) On this island, Saint Mochaoi founded the Monastery of Nendrum about the year A.D. 445.

Who was this Mochaoi whose name can still reverberate out of the past after fifteen hundred years? He was a personal disciple of Saint Patrick, but more important in a sense than Benignus or any other personal disciple of whom we know. Mochaoi was the son of Bronach, who was the daughter of Miliucc, Patrick's Druid master when the Apostle was in captivity in Ireland, and from whom he successfully made his escape. Tradition has it that Miliucc's children had been kind to the Christian slave, and Patrick all his life testified gratitude to them. When he returned to Ireland on his evangelizing mission in 432, those children were grown up and Bronach had an adult son, this Mochaoi, who was converted, ordained priest, and finally consecrated bishop by Patrick.

The territory of Island Mahee had fallen into the Apostle's possession in a very unexpected way. It had been the stronghold of a Pagan chieftain, named MacCuil, who resisted every effort made to convert him. His favourite amusement was the plundering and slaughtering of Christian communities. Such a savage tyrant and marauder was he that the old lives describe him as a Cyclops and a Son of Death. One writer (Muirchu) sums him up comprehensively as "depraved in thoughts,

¹ *The Monastery of Saint Mochaoi of Nendrum*, by H. C. Lawlor, M.A., Belfast, Nat. Historical and Phil. Society, 1925.

violent in word, malicious in deeds, bitter in spirit, wrathful in disposition, villainous in body, cruel in mind, heathenish in life, monstrous in conscience."

But one day this MacCuil and Patrick had a brief and memorable encounter. It is a story too lengthy to be inserted here, but Patrick won the day. MacCuil's conversion was very complete. He handed over to Patrick all his possessions and quitted the shores of Ireland forever, later becoming a great bishop in the Isle of Man, where a barony, a parish, a headland and an island still perpetuate his name.

Patrick transferred his new possession in Strangford Lough to Mochaoi, who turned the chieftain's settlement into a Christian monastery. At that time the island was called Nendrum (pronounced *Néndrim*) meaning nine ridges, or knolls. The traveller who views the island as he walks across from the mainland to-day would hardly describe it as undulating. It presents a vista uniformly low and flat. But there is said to be a point in Island Reagh, lying north of Mahee, from which the nine knolls of Mahee are clearly visible. I must confess that I did not traverse the neighbouring island in order to confirm the congruity of the name. So you may take it or leave it.

But you see now why Nendrum has an historical appeal even stronger than that of Lough Derg or Croagh Patrick? One who seeks traces of the Apostle in both these districts will in each case be rewarded. But Nendrum—I claim—is more eloquent than even these. Here one shifts so easily back into the fifth century. Here the study of history changes from a wearisome labour over books into living drama. At Nendrum, especially, fifteen hundred years are as though they had never been. The centuries are suddenly telescoped.

The framework of this monastic foundation, the white-capped waters of the Lough, called grimly by the Norseman who rowed against it, the *Strang fjord*, is the same now as then. The chief sound of the place, a murmuring wind, is the same. If one listens long, one can almost hear the voices of Mochaoi and his brethren rising and falling in prayer. This, you say, is imaginative. One can do more. One can handle objects which they certainly handled. I will tell you about these relics in a moment. To hold them in one's hands is a moving experience, causing the dry bones of history to live more

effectively than the perusal of whole libraries of books.

The first thing which attracts the eye on approaching Nendrum are the low, straggling remains of those walls called cashels. These are the earliest class of ruins laid bare on the Island and are prehistoric. Cashels such as these are typical of the settlements of Pictish chiefs, who were gradually conquered by the Celts in their progress up from the south about the fourth century B.C. MacCuil, the Pagan chieftain won over to Christianity by Patrick, had been living in the adapted settlement of a Pictish ruler, enjoying the protection of the massive, dry-built walls constructed to endure through centuries. These cashels were usually three in number, built elliptically one inside the other, with broad walks and often buildings between them. The remains of all three cashels can be traced in Nendrum. The original height of the walls was probably twelve feet, with a rampart of sods on top. In each wall there was a gate, six feet wide and surmounted by wooden beams. The third, or outermost cashel, was nine feet thick, the second seven feet and the third, or innermost, six feet. Certainly, if MacCuil preserved his settlement in its original state of security, he could from Nendrum defy the world that he harried so ruthlessly. These cashels speak eloquently of the kind of civilization overthrown by Patrick.

Besides these prehistoric remains, two other classes of ruins have been opened up on the Island: early mediæval and late mediæval. The last-named are the least important. They will attract your attention in the shape of a church ruin standing in the centre of the space enclosed by the innermost cashel. But prominent though it be, do not linger long over this ruin. It was never of much importance, or anything more interesting than a very modest parish church, which was already dilapidated in the seventeenth century.

The real joy of the excavations carried out on this Island are the early mediæval ruins, which link us up with Mochaoi. Of this class of ruins, the remains of the school-house are easily the most interesting. It lies west of the church, a rectangular enclosure readily distinguishable in the space between the innermost cashel and the second cashel. Sit in this Celtic school enclosure and reflect on the miracle of its preservation. The voices of pupils resounded here at a period—the only period—

when "Island of Saints and Scholars" was not a vain boast. The school had evidently been roofed with wooden beams, over which thatch had been laid. Charred wood and straw were found in the covering soil and even nails that had held the roof beams in place. How is it known that this enclosure was indeed the school building? The excavations revealed it. The relics found on the floor proved that it had been used as the monastic school. They were chiefly tablets of slate or stone, with designs inscribed on them by means of iron styles.

Let me explain the charred wood and straw which were found in the covering soil of this school-house. The end of the Nendrum Monastery was a fire: all the buildings went up in flames lighted by Danish pirates. Probably because of its stout defences, the monastery was one of the last to capitulate to the enemy. It continued in existence for some hundred years after Strangford Lough had become what might virtually be described as a Scandinavian lake. The Norsemen were in almost complete possession of its shores and islands during the ninth century. The wiping out of Nendrum is thus recorded briefly in the *Annals*: "974 A.D. Sedna O'Deman was burned in his own house." O'Deman was the last of the Irish Abbots of Nendrum. From the date of his death, the history of this Celtic Monastery ceases. In the fifteenth century, Nendrum figures in records as a parish centre with an unimportant church, but its pristine glory was never restored. During the excavations, not in the school building only, but everywhere throughout the settlement, unmistakable evidence was found of a conflagration, a massacre, and a flight of the inhabitants having taken place before the deposits of centuries sealed the ruins from view.

Under this seal of the ages, Mahee had immovably rested. No antiquarian importance was ever attached to it until the year 1844. Modern residences had been built on it, some part of it was under cultivation, but its greater area was a bramble-grown wilderness. In that year, the famous scholar, Dr. Reeves, visited the place to look at a lime-kiln, and immediately saw that that which was supposed to be a lime-kiln was in reality the ivy-covered stump of a round tower. Divining the presence of very interesting ruins, he caused digging operations to be begun on a grassy mound. His surmise proved

correct. An ancient church ruin quickly came to light. Nendrum was speedily identified with Mahee and Mochaioi. And with this discovery a great shaft of light was thrown on early Christian Ireland.

But those three classes of ruins, now so easily recognized in a survey of Nendrum, were not all at once laid bare in 1844. Excavations were not carried very far at that date before the work had to be suspended. Sufficient had been discovered, however, to arouse great interest in the site.

After that, oblivion settled down once more upon the Island, and remained undisturbed for eighty years, until the Belfast Archæological Society resumed the excavations there in 1922. The skill and completeness with which the work was then carried out is the Society's crowning glory. One could hardly overpraise their achievement. The work went on all through the summers of 1922, 1923 and 1924, and was discontinued only when it had reached a remarkable stage of perfection.

To understand the value of this work, something of the incredible labour involved should be known. I will give only three details. The visitor will notice a fence of earth, or a protecting dyke, built up all around and completely enclosing the church ruins and graves. This earthwork is not part of the ruins. Though now completely overgrown with grass, forming a magnificent green wall, it is modern in origin. Look well at its extent: it is built up out of the hundreds and hundreds of tons of stones and soil that were cleared away in uncovering the ruins. All that débris was sifted for relics, even riddled spadeful by spadeful, before being piled up there. Secondly: the site was almost completely covered over with bushes and, before the digging could be begun, the bushes had to be tugged out by the roots by means of horses with chains; in some cases these roots, entrenched for centuries, had pushed immense stones out of their places in the buried walls. Lastly: in order to reconstruct some of the pottery from the pieces found, it was not uncommon for two men to spend, say, four days riddling spadefuls of soil from a determined area and placing to one side all the pottery fragments found. These were then washed, sorted and fitted together like a jigsaw puzzle. Perhaps half a pot would result from joining together pieces selected from a

barrowful of fragments. Even then the excavators would count themselves lucky if they succeeded in determining at least the shape of one vessel.

It became clear that the drawing and writing classes had been in progress when the Danes were sighted from the island. Even four of the iron styles were found just as they had perhaps dropped from the hands of the startled pupils. Anything more interesting to the student of history than those broken tablets it would be hard to imagine. The method of teaching was obviously the "copy-from-a-headline" method. On some of the tablets an exemplar, perhaps a triquetra, or a spiral, or a Celtic decoration design, or a letter, is drawn by the firm and skilful hand of the master and underneath it are some feeble and straggling copies. There are tablets on which the alphabet was being practised, and the improvement that comes with practice can be clearly traced. On one of the tablets, half a triquetra is drawn and there is nothing in the space underneath, so that one can see the exact point where master and pupil were interrupted.

One tablet stands out from the rest in its drollery. The pupil had set out to draw a horse in gallop, but made the mistake of beginning the head too near the centre of his tablet. When he came to the tail, he found his horse would not fit in the space available. Determined to finish the animal, he curved him round and made the horse sit down with his hind legs elegantly crossed! Anything more waggishly apologetical than this seated nag. . . . And how alike is boyhood in every century. Laughter must surely have echoed under the roof-beams at this pupil's effort. But the majority of the students in this school must have been adults. The styles found are five inches long, with the upper end terminating in a flat disc to rest against the knuckle of the forefinger. As you can test for yourself, these styles were made for the hand of an adult.

All the relics and pottery found on Island Mahee are preserved in the Belfast Municipal Museum, in a special case labelled "Nendrum." The case is locked, but the Curator, one of the most agreeable gentlemen of my acquaintance, will probably unlock it for you as readily as he did for me, and allow you to examine those precious finds at your leisure. The most valuable object in this

case is a bell, now somewhat eaten with rust, which troubles those interested in the relic's preservation. This bell was found buried below the ground level at a point near the north gate, outside the third cashel wall. Normally the Danes would land on the island at the south-west, where the original quay was built. All the evidence therefore goes to show that the bell was buried for safety by one of the monks in flight. The monastic bell of Celtic times was held in great veneration and carefully preserved. It is highly probable that this was the original bell used when the monastery was first equipped by Saint Mochaoi. It is the same shape as, but somewhat smaller than the famous bell of St. Patrick preserved in Dublin and rung at the Congress Mass in the Phoenix Park. The tongue of the Nendrum bell is missing. I was allowed to hold this bell in my hands and the kindly Curator exhibited no impatience at my protracted reverie.

I have not told one-half the wonders of Nendrum which, when you discover them, will people the region for you with its ancient, crowded, and busy life. Such communities as lived here were entirely self-contained and self-supporting, and therefore the buildings included much more than church, refectory, sleeping-quarters, guest-chambers and schoolroom.² There were the usual farm buildings, a kiln, a game store, a corn mill, a carpenter's shop, a smithy, and every kind of artificer's workshop. All this activity can be vividly resurrected at Nendrum. There are the remains of a janitor's cell, of a brazier's workshop, indeterminate oval and round buildings, deep ovens and large middens, a monk's well and a monk's seat, paved paths and floors of antiquity. The poor monk who paused in his wild flight to bury the bell, never returned as he had hoped, to draw it again from its hiding-place and send its prayerful summons abroad. But so good was the form of life that was lived here, so full of constructive energy and sanity, it could not be finally destroyed by the enemies of Christendom. It was but momentarily checked and diverted, to blossom out irresistibly elsewhere from the same kind of soil, but in more secure refuges of the island.

² C.f. *Life of St. Columba, Founder of Hy*, by Adamnan, edited by Reeves, Edinburgh, 1875, a book indispensable to the student of Celtic Ireland.

DO WE THINK ABOUT INDIA?

BY THE REV. C. C. MARTINDALE, S.J.

MR. EDGAR WALLACE, I think, insists that coincidences occur in threes. The other day I was thinking about a man who, I suppose, had not come into my head since I met him in Oxford in, I think, 1903. (We never, then, got nearer his name than Obadiah. It was, in reality, Upadhyayji.) Within two days an Indian visitor called and asked if I had read the account of a remarkable Indian Catholic in the May number of the *New Review*, a bulletin that began to appear this year at Calcutta. It was, in fact, an estimate of the character and work of that long-ago visitor. Whether an unusual amount of visits from Indians, this summer, can count as the third coincidence, I do not know.

What is making me feel penitent is my quite clear memory of how totally we—I think I can say “we” and not merely “I”—failed to understand in the least what he was about. In the concrete, he wanted to found Chairs for the study of Hindu thought at Oxford, Cambridge and Edinburgh; and at Cambridge he formed an influential committee, which did not, however, accept the lecturer he proposed to it. So the scheme fell through. Dr. Caird, Dr. McTaggart, and the Boden Professor of Sanskrit (to whom the discovery of his own magazine, *Twentieth Century*, in the Bodleian, had introduced Upadhyayji), presided at lectures on Hindu philosophy, but nothing came of all this. Most people were as vague about him as we were. We observed a courteous massively built gentleman, muffled in dim draperies, of whom his landlady said, anxiously, that he sat nearly all day in his room doing nothing, and ate so little she feared he would die on her, and was she sure of her rent? She could have been, for people were kind. He arrived in England possessed of one shilling only, which he at once gave away to a destitute girl: he told me with simplicity that he had not realized that English—let alone Christian and Catholic—hospitality was so limited. (We put him up for some time, afterwards, at Manresa house, Roehampton, which he liked because it facilitated meditation. But after all, it is a noviciate,

and he did not propose to become a novice.) He gave us one special lecture at Pope's (now Campion) Hall, upon the Indian concept of God, which started from the idea of Bliss. Fr. O'Fallon Pope, the absolute scholastic, agreed that there was a method by which the Indian's philosophy could be so recast as not to retain an offensively non-Aquinate shape.¹ After a while, he went back to India, and we heard he was engaged in politics, and looked on askance by nearly everyone. Briefly, his history was as follows:—

He was born February 2nd, 1861, and brought up a Brahmin, with a rigid respect for truth, having an "iron will," and imbued with patriotic fervour. At school he developed a passionate love for Sanskrit literature (as well as for Walter Scott), and also for mathematics (he would spend Pascalian nights working out problems), and was first rate at cricket, football, wrestling, swimming etc. He was nicknamed "lion's cub," and led attacks upon Armenians who were worrying Hindu ladies while bathing, and scrubbed their noses on the ground. He very early resolved to remain celibate, and said later that if marriage were a "thing," he would hang it. He became intoxicated with the idea of Indian independence, resolved to win it even by the sword, and twice tried to become a soldier. At Calcutta, he continued to study Bengali, Sanskrit, Hindi and Greek; edited magazines for the advancement of young men, and had charge of athletics in the Concord Club. He met two religious "geniuses," about whose tenets I know nothing, and can only say that his life became "spiritualized," and that from one of them he learnt a "great love for the personality of Christ." His own Biblical studies and his association with various Anglican and other groups, convinced him that Christ was "the Sinless One," and then that He was the One to whom Sonship was eternally communicated by the Father. He then

¹ I hope not to be thought frivolous if I mention that the above paragraph was interrupted for three quarters of an hour by an interview concerning someone who has lost the Catholic Faith through the influence of an Indian mystic. This gentleman, having collected some £20,000, so I am told, in Europe and the U.S.A. in a very short time, then went broke, and is now observing a five years' vow of silence on an Indian mountain. None the less, he is acting in *distans* sufficiently to break up English homes. Here, then, is perhaps the third coincidence.

severed his connection with the Hyderabad Academy where he had been labouring for the "social and moral elevation of Sindh." Should he be baptized? He had felt that "Indian followers of Christ" should hold aloof from the warring (and imported) Christian sects, and develop an Indian Christianity, "on good terms" with the rest, but independent. Still, he saw that Christ certainly had taught baptism; so in 1891 he was baptized by a clergyman, affirming none the less that this did not make him a member of the Church of England. That same night he was asked by a census clerk if he were Roman Catholic or Protestant? "Neither," he said. "Put me down as an Indian Catholic." At Multan, he hit upon di Bruno's *Catholic Belief*. Back at Hyderabad, he studied in the library attached to the Catholic church there, and later that year was received into the Church, taking Brahmabandhav, i.e., Theophilus, as baptismal name. Some educated Indian youths followed him. The upheaval was such that he could not get a house: he found one, at last, belonging to a Mohammedan; then, one belonging to a Jew.

In 1893 he produced a book on the Existence of God; then, various magazines. To show that Christianity does not "de-nationalize," he adopted the life of a *Bhikshu*, or mendicant, and travelled around lecturing, and disputing with anti-Christians and theosophists. To establish his ideal, he hoped to found a monastery of Hindu Catholic monks, Hindu in all externals, Catholic in faith. "By birth we are Hindu and shall remain Hindu till death. But as *dvija* (twice-born), by virtue of our sacramental re-birth, we are Catholic. We are members of an indefectible communion embracing all ages and climes. In customs . . . we are genuine Hindus; but in our faith we are neither Hindu, nor European, nor American, nor Chinese, but all-inclusive. Our faith . . . is not confined to any country or race; our faith is universal and consequently includes all truths." Catholic authorities were divided about the opportuneness of this: finally, the papal delegate banned his religious writings. Upadhyayji loyally stopped them, and opened a school which he placed under Animananda, the writer of this article, who companioned him for fourteen years, though differing from him "not a little in his educational and religious policy and methods."

Dr. Animananda has worked independently of him ever since, but retains for him, most loyally, "a feeling of sorrowful, filial gratitude and reverence."

About this time Upadhyayji made close friends with Rabindranath Tagore,² and to some extent they collaborated in educational enterprises that succeeded but in part. In 1902, he decided to place himself, and his writings, at the feet of the Pope, and he left for Europe armed with a blanket, a begging-bowl, and a letter from the Archbishop of Calcutta. In Rome, he was advised to "create a strong public opinion in his favour" before actually visiting the Sovereign Pontiff, and then came to England, where Cardinal Vaughan was kind to him and introduced him to the *Tablet* where he wrote more than once. It was then that he went to Oxford and Cambridge. He returned thence (this seems to me significant) convinced that not only Europeans were unable to appreciate the Vedanta philosophy (he himself strongly believed in Caste), but that *Indians themselves* were blind to it, were going after false gods, were (this is our own deduction) wantoning after the worst elements in occidental materialism, and so, destroying their only hope of becoming a true Indian nation able to take its honourable part in a true harmony of nations. If this deduction is justified, we are more than inclined to believe as he did. He returned to India, not exactly "embittered" as a man, but bitterly hostile to the English educational system in India, and, as such, a fierce journalistic antagonist to what was actually going on.

He died suddenly after an operation on October 27th, 1907. He had been, at the one extreme, accused of being a pro-European spy; and, at the other, of having ceased to be a Christian, so impossible did it seem for an

² In another article of this issue of the *New Review*, "The Personal Equation" (in Education), we learn that Tagore was an "old boy" of St. Xavier's, Calcutta. Tagore mentions a teacher there, Fr. de Peneranda, whose memory transfigured his school days. "Whenever I looked at him, his spirit seemed to be in prayer, a deep peace to pervade him within and without. . . ." This priest once asked the boy: "Are you not well?" "It was only a simple question, but one I have never been able to forget. . . . Even to-day the memory of that great soul seems to give me a passport into the silent seclusion of the temple of God."

Indian to be both a true Hindu and a genuine Christian. To this view he gave hostages. He underwent "social penance," the *prâyascitta*—not because he was not a Christian, but because he had mixed with foreigners. He said it was hopeless to preach Christianity to his fellow-countrymen who had so "crude" an idea of what he might be meaning. He preached the Vedanta as foundation for future Christianity. But he added: "When will the day come when I shall speak of Christ to my fellow-countrymen!" And on his death-bed he was constant in invocations to Our Lord. And the author insists that no one conversant with him or his writings could regard his identification of "faith" with the Catholic Faith as anything but evident.

The present writer is not an Indian expert, though he was taught from boyhood often to think about India and was given, he now thinks, sound (and unconsciously Catholic) directive ideas. He would like to say, first, that he thinks the *New Review* to be a very remarkable Catholic production indeed; and the perusal of even one of its variegated issues (this one contains articles by men and women of three or four nationalities on Thomas More; the occidental God-Concept; historical, educational, artistic and political topics; on a Worker's life in Soviet Russia; and first-rate reviews—though books sent from England are in a minority compared with those from France and the U.S.A.) might suffice to justify him. Further, he is conscious that many a hard-working priest may feel that the whole subject is too remote: he has his parish, and the work there is absorbing and even exhausting—how can he think about India? How, above all, can he hope (even if he wishes) *to re-fashion his mind till he thinks as Indians think?*

It remains that *someone must*. At present, Catholic missionaries in India, are Irish, Italian, French, Spanish, Portuguese, German, American—almost anyone rather than English, so that the overwhelmingly preponderant non-religious element of European invasion, which is English, is also non-Catholic; and since what clever young Indians bring back from our Universities is very far indeed from Catholic, small wonder if the Indian sees Christianity (i.) as Protestant, or, if Catholic, as non-English; and, in either case, (ii.) as anti-Indian. This is putting it strongly: but I doubt if it could be

put too strongly. A similar statement certainly could not be, so far as Africa goes; and the Abyssinian campaign, if it comes off (we write in August) will deal a dreadful blow, not precisely, or primarily, at Christianity (for Abyssinia is Christian in its traditional way), but at Roman Christianity specifically; yet, none the less, at all Christianity, for all the other nationalities of Africa will see in a successful war, or any war, an onslaught of Europeanism (and Christianity appears to them as "White") against the Black world. The more successful it is, the bitterer the feeling towards all that the conquerer brings. But that is a digression.

One is often tempted to think that the Holy Father despairs of Europe, so passionately eager is he to remind us that the East is changing with "vertiginous rapidity"—he said that of Africa; but how truly could he say so about Japan, China even, and India; so does he urge missionaries to act "extensively" and establish outposts everywhere; so does he hasten the creation of a native Clergy and indeed Episcopate. He underlines the duty of missionary priests or nuns from Europe as being the making of themselves unnecessary so soon as possible. Not for me to intrude my own ideas about the shifting of cultural centres of gravity and so forth. But perhaps one can safely say that it is *good* for anyone to think, at times, about what seems totally off his beat, rather as I used to beg Ruskin College, at Oxford, to let me lecture to its working-men (stuffed till their eyes bulged with economics) on something Totally Useless, like Greek Tragedians—I *knew* they would be interested (not that I ever *was* let). Yet can it, Catholic-wise, be totally useless to think about "India," "Africa," even when my next job is a Children of Mary's outing, or, as mine may be, meeting a Poplar stevedore who has difficulties about free-will . . . ? Well, our work may be *here*; but our sympathy and our prayers can go everywhere, provided we know enough to imagine more, and are not indifferent.

We have written of a man who was an athlete and a would-be soldier: we cannot picture him as a hot-house study-nursed weakling; this linguist and mathematician was no fake-artist, trading on alleged inspiration to disguise lack of craftsmanship. Even those who had to separate themselves from him saw his life to be heroic.

It was certainly ascetic in the extreme, though you would have noticed it from nothing in his demeanour: possibly his very tired eyes, or a sort of "distance" that he gently kept between himself and you, might have made you guess it. He was tackling a problem so tremendous that as a rule it escapes our very notice. No wonder his touch was often uncertain; his phrasing (especially when speaking a language, after all, not his own), inaccurate; his emotions (again, he was part and parcel of the problem: he was an Indian; in a sense, he felt himself to be India), at times too vehement; his method of preaching the Vedanta as "foundation" for a later preaching of Christianity, may have been mistaken—perhaps St. Paul felt that he had made, just once, at Athens, a part-similar mistake; but it was to be made again and again by those apologists who sought to propitiate Roman officials by showing how spiritual was their worship of God, how sweetly reasonable their ethic, but practically or quite omitted the Name of Jesus. One is always sorry if a man like Upadhyayji has simply to be "banned." One wishes that most sympathetic occidental scholars and theologians should have invited him to stay with them, and helped his most receptive intelligence to provide that *labor improbus* in studying our philosophy which Fr. Johannis, for example, has given to the Indian philosophies.³ If it can be said that "the last word in Indian philosophy is: "Let us make ourselves for God by wholesale surrender, for God has made Himself for us by wholesale surrender"—what marvellous points of contact there must be, between the Indian and the Catholic minds! But the question remains—is not the possibility of contact, let alone actual contact, likely to become more and more remote? Everything indicates (i.) a creation, or revival, of nationalist mentality in the East and in Africa; and (ii.) the further darkening of its appropriate "shadow," abhorrence for European ways of thinking. *Somehow* the problem must be solved—How, without any risk to orthodoxy, we are to teach the Catholic Faith to these minds so different from ours. If we do not, the problem may very soon be insoluble.

³ We are glad to see that the *New Review*, having discussed a great number of new books on India, says that "the best is also the shortest," i.e., Fr. Johannis' pamphlet on Hinduism in the C.T.S. series of Religions, edited by Dr. Messenger.

COMMUNISM IN GREAT BRITAIN: ANOTHER VIEW

BY CAPT. T. W. C. CURD.

IT is just possible that in his review of the Communist situation in Great Britain, in the *CLERGY REVIEW* for February, Fr. FitzGerald is using the weapon of veiled ridicule, aiming at getting the Communist "menace" laughed *at* for its apparent failures and thereby laughed *out* of existence. That is just possible, but in spite of Fr. FitzGerald's attempt I am afraid a good many of his readers will fail to see the joke; they will take his article and its conclusions seriously and will be led to believe that the Communist menace, so far as Great Britain is concerned, is already a thing of the past. And that is a dangerous conclusion to draw, because it might lead to a relaxation of the anti-Communist effort and because it is by no means certain that the Communist menace in Great Britain to-day is not far greater than it was when Fr. FitzGerald wrote his other article two years ago.

Fr. FitzGerald writes (p. 100): "The influence of the Communist Party is definitely on the decline," and that early sentence seems to mark his view-point all through the article. He is obsessed by the idea of "Party," whereas the truth is that the "Party" does not matter at all; it is the *mind* that matters. This mistaken view-point is repeated on p. 101 where he writes: "The question at issue surely is this: Do these contacts result in a strengthening of the Communist Party in Great Britain?" I submit that this is not the question at issue at all. The fate of the Communist Party is not of the least interest or significance. The question, especially for Catholics, surely is whether these contacts result in the spread of what we may call the Communist *religion*? That is the question we have to face. And that is a question Fr. FitzGerald's article does not attempt to answer.

On p. 102 we find the blunt statement: "Judged by the standard of numbers Communism has failed." The

numbers, be it noted, are the numbers of those enrolled in the Communist Party. Of the numbers of those who have become imbued with the atheistic outlook of Communism no account is taken. And, of course, these are the numbers that will count in the long run.

On p. 103 we are told that "The Communist Party being a working-class organization must of necessity seek its key positions in the official National Labour Movement. . . . Its failure has been complete." If Fr. FitzGerald had called his article by some such title as "The Communist *Party* in Great Britain" there might be some justification for this statement. But what matters is not the *Party* but the "*ism*." And Communism is by no means confined to the official National Labour Movement for its key positions. It already holds such positions in our universities (MacMurray at London, Cole at Oxford, Dobb at Cambridge); in the London School of Economics and in the B.B.C.

On the same page we are told that "The National Labour Movement has definitely freed itself from Communist entanglements." Yet it has quite recently elected Sir Stafford Cripps to a seat on its councils and only rejected the true Communist plan of "confiscation without compensation" in the nationalization of certain industries because the people are "*not yet educated*" to the acceptance of such a doctrine. Furthermore, the National Labour Movement is so closely allied to the Co-operative Movement that the two are sometimes indistinguishable; and the Co-operative Societies are hot-beds of Communism. The *Wheatsheaf* (London Co-operative Society magazine, October, 1934) tells us that the next Government is to be "Socialist and Co-operative," and that "the co-operative ideal surmounts all barriers of country, class and *creed*." Delegates from Moscow were welcomed by the International Co-operative Alliance and their hands were clasped "in co-operative fellowship" by delegates from this country. A "Co-operative Church" is to be set up on, of course, "strictly non-sectarian lines"; meanwhile, the children are being trained in true Communist ideas at Co-operative festivals, that held at the Crystal Palace last year featuring 8,000 children (4,500 of them children of members of the London Co-operative Society) singing the blasphemous hymn of international Com-

munism, the "Internationale." This does not look as though the National Labour Movement—going hand-in-hand with the Co-operative Movement—has "freed itself from Communist entanglements."

Fr. FitzGerald instances the Labour publication called *The Communist Solar System* as evidence of Labour's hostility to various subversive Communist societies, whose "penetrating tactics" the pamphlet was issued to unmask. Perhaps Fr. FitzGerald does not know that some of the most dangerous of the Communist organizations are not listed in *The Solar System* and therefore do not come under the ban.

On p. 105 we are reminded that there is not a single Communist member in Parliament. The other day Dr. O'Donovan told us that a fellow M.P. came up to him and asked: "*You don't believe in all this God business, do you?*" Of course, this M.P. is not *officially* a member of the Communist Party, but when you have men of this type of mind in Parliament does the official label matter?

On p. 106 Fr. FitzGerald tells us that: "Weak in numbers, unable to capture key positions in either the Trade Union Movement or in the British Labour Party, the Communists have only one further means of extending their influence. It is by the power of propaganda." Reference is then made to *one* piece of propaganda, the *Daily Worker*, and its failure to become a paying proposition. The writer then goes on: "And thus, to sum up, we find that from every point of view Communism seems to be in a state of decline."

The *Daily Worker* is, of course, a subsidized piece of propaganda, receiving large sums from Moscow. But the *Daily Worker* is only one (and not the most important or effective) of many Communist publications issued and distributed in this country. The *Daily Worker* is easily put into the shade by some of the splendidly produced and beautifully illustrated magazines. Nor is the Press the only form of Communist propaganda. The stage and the film play a very large part. Communist films, produced in Russia under Soviet supervision, are amongst the finest and most artistically produced screen work of the world. Produced on 16mm. film-stock of the non-flam. kind they are exhibited freely throughout this country in "Workers'" halls, co-operative halls and

similar buildings; as they do not come within the regulations of public authorities no licence or censorship certificate is required; consequently it is not surprising to find the Communists making the most of this particular form of propaganda. The claim was put forward quite recently that 8,000 exhibitions of this kind had been given throughout this country in various halls and schools.

But Fr. FitzGerald should watch, not the *Daily Worker* but the *Daily Herald*, the mouthpiece of the National Labour Movement. The *Herald's* attitude over Spain, Austria, Russia and our own country is so clearly tainted with the Communist and anti-religious outlook that I wonder Fr. FitzGerald could have overlooked it. In the Spanish crisis the *Herald* sided with the revolutionaries who were subsidized from Moscow and who heralded their rising with the wholesale murder of priests and seminary students. In the Austrian crisis the *Herald* sided with the slayers of Dr. Dollfuss. But the same revolutionaries in Germany fill the *Herald* with loathing and contempt. This seems strange and contradictory till we realize that the revolutionaries in Austria are the Nazis who were opposed to a Catholic form of government and to a Catholic Chancellor, while the same Nazis in Germany have opposed *Communism*. In a recent leader page article in the *Herald* we were told that "What the Russians have done is fundamentally what the British Labour Movement will do as soon as it is returned to power, and has, in fact, most thoroughly worked out the plans for doing." This writer went on: "Russian economics are Socialist . . . their economic policy is magnificent." When we remember that the keystone to Russia's economic policy is the Five-Year Plan and that the Five-Year Plan is essentially anti-God we can realize something of the *Herald's* attitude towards Communism and Communist "penetrating tactics" in this country. And the *Herald*, as already noted, is the mouthpiece of Britain's "National Labour Movement" and has the largest circulation of any daily paper in England, exceeding even the Capitalist *Mail* and *Express*.

With reference to Fr. FitzGerald's insistence on the numerical weakness of the (official) Communists in Great Britain it is interesting to note that in his Catholic Truth Society pamphlet on "*Communism*" Fr. Lewis Watt

points out (page 22) that: "It must be remembered that the Russian Communist Party as a whole is but an *insignificant fraction* of the total population of the U.S.S.R." (Italics mine.) It is this "insignificant fraction" that has put the Russian people in chains. It is, again, a fraction of the population that has imposed the misrule of atheistic Communism on the people of Mexico. Clearly, the *numerical weakness* of which Fr. FitzGerald makes so much in his effort to discount the Communist menace is no guarantee of safety.

On p. 109 Fr. FitzGerald tells us that "They [the workers of Great Britain] have purged their movement of subversive and disruptive Communist elements." How can this be reconciled with the constant letting of the "workers'" halls all over the country to Communist organizations for the spreading of Communist propaganda, the exhibition of subversive films, the staging of blasphemous plays, the meetings of the so-called "cultural" and "educative" societies and the holding of meetings whose sole purpose is the penetration of the minds of those attending them with the Communist poison?

It is fervently to be hoped that no reader of Fr. FitzGerald's article will allow himself to be persuaded that the Communist menace so far as Great Britain is concerned no longer exists, or is even on the wane. Surely that is what the Communists would wish us to believe! Communism is simply organized Atheism, and as such it is the most serious enemy of the Church's further progress in this or any other country, as recent events have proved. Anything that tends to a relaxation of the Catholic counter-effort is to be deplored. Communism is of the devil, and the devil is not so easily defeated.

POPE CLEMENT VII AND BIGAMY

BY THE REV. E. C. MESSENGER, Ph.D.

NOT long ago the Rev. C. J. Cadoux, a writer well known for his attacks on the Catholic Church, sent a letter to a daily newspaper protesting against the description of the Pope as "the custodian of the indissoluble tie of matrimony"—a phrase used in the Decree of Canonization of Thomas More and John Fisher. The reverend gentleman quoted the following statement from a work by another Protestant minister, the Rev. T. M. Lindsay :

"The interests of morality were so little in the mind [of Pope Clement VII, who had to deal with King Henry VIII's application for a divorce] that Clement proposed to Henry more than once that the King might take a second wife without . . . having his first marriage declared null and void. . . . He was prepared to tolerate bigamy, but not thwart Charles."¹

For some reason, best known to himself, Dr. Cadoux omits an interesting statement which occurs in Lindsay after the words "null and void." It is as follows: "This had been the Papal solution of the matter in the earlier instance, and Clement VII saw no reason why what had been allowed to the King of Spain should be denied to the King of England." For this remarkable accusation a reference is given to the *Spanish State Papers*, II, 379.

The same accusation, that the Pope allowed bigamy to a Spanish king and offered the same to Henry VIII, has been made by a historian of a very different calibre, namely, Mr. A. F. Pollard, in his *Henry VIII*. He says (p. 207) that the Spanish dispensation for bigamy would have suited Henry admirably, "but apparently he was unaware of this useful example. . . . The demand would not, however, have shocked the Pope so much as his modern defenders, for, on September 18th, 1530, Casale writes to Henry: 'A few days since, the Pope secretly proposed to me the following condition: that your Majesty might be allowed to have two wives. I told him I could not undertake to make any such proposition, because I did not know whether it would satisfy your Majesty's conscience. . . .'"²

It will be interesting to examine this supposed Papal dispensation for bigamy. The matter was convincingly explained in an article in the *Dublin Review* in October, 1913, but it would seem that Dr. Cadoux is unacquainted with this. Taking this

¹ *History of the Reformation*, Vol. II, p. 324.

² *Letters and Papers*, IV, p. 2987. To this reference Pollard and Lindsay add two others, but do not quote them.

article as our guide, and supplementing it from Pastor's *History of the Popes*, we will proceed briefly to demolish this startling Protestant statement. And first we will deal with the supposed Papal dispensation for bigamy granted to the Spanish king.

The only authority for this mentioned by Lindsay or Pollard is a Memoir of the Privy Council of Castile under date January, 1522 :

"King Henry IV (of Castile) married, in the year 1417, Dona Blanca, a Princess of Aragon. . . . He had no issue by her, and some people pretended that it was the fault of the Queen, whilst others thought that the King was impotent. After having been married some years, King Henry IV asked to have another wife, and the Pope gave him a Bull of Dispensation permitting him to contract another marriage, on condition that he should return to his first wife if within a fixed time he should not have issue by his second Queen."³

Now, as Mr. N. E. Hardy, the writer of the *Dublin Review* article shows, this statement made in 1522 is definitely contradicted by historians writing earlier than that date, and nearer to the actual date of the supposed dispensation, and, as Prescott, the well-known historian, says : "The marriage between Blanche and Henry was publicly declared void by the Bishop of Segovia, confirmed by the Archbishop of Toledo, '*por impotencia respectiva*, owing to some malign influence.' "

And this statement is made on the authority of three writers, *two of whom were contemporary with the event in question*. Not a word is said of this by either Lindsay or Pollard, and we are asked instead to accept the statement made over a hundred years later, by "men who were no more accurate historians than profound theologians,"⁴ and who had excellent political grounds for trying to establish the illegitimacy of a certain lady who was supposed to be the offspring of the second marriage. Further, "the Bull of Dispensation for bigamy is only the first of three stories which are to prove Juana's illegitimacy."⁵

It is clear, then, that *what Henry of Castile asked for and obtained was a declaration* that his first marriage was null, on account of impotency, this being a sufficient ground in Canon Law for such a decree of nullity.

Pollard says, and apparently rightly, that this particular case was unknown to Henry VIII. But it is curious that Henry sent Dr. Knight to Rome in 1527 with a request that he might be allowed two wives,⁶ and repeated the request through Briant

³ *Calendar of Spanish Papers*, II, 379.

⁴ *Dublin Review*.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 271.

⁶ Letter in *English Historical Review*, XI, 597.

and Vannes in 1528.⁷ True, Knight wrote to Henry saying that he did not think he would obtain this dispensation,⁸ and in consequence Henry sent instructions to Knight not to make the request.⁹ But it would really seem that the request was made, or the idea suggested, perhaps indirectly. At any rate, in the *State Papers*, there are three reports to England containing Papal statements on the matter. One of these, that of Casale of September 18th, 1530, we have quoted at the beginning of this article.

The second statement occurs in the course of a report by Dr. Benet, October 27th, 1530. Its language must be carefully noted :

" Shortly after Benet's coming here, the Pope spoke to him of a dispensation for two wives, but so doubtfully that Benet suspects he spoke it for two purposes, one so that he should break it to the King, and see if it would be accepted, thereby he should have gotten a mean to bring Your Highness to grant that if he might, dispense in this case, which is of no less force than your case is [i.e., the question of the validity of the Papal dispensation in virtue of which Henry had married Katherine], consequently he might dispense in Your Highness's case [i.e., the marriage with Katherine, which would thus be perfectly valid]. The other was to entertain the king and defer the cause.

" Benet asked the Pope whether he was resolved that he could dispense in that case. He said ' No,' but he had been told by a great doctor he might for the avoidance of a greater scandal, but he would advise further with his Council. Lately he has said plainly, that he cannot do it."¹⁰

The third reference is the following : Ghinucci to Henry VIII, September, 1530 :

" Reports another interview with His Holiness upon the Sunday, when the Pope said he could with less scandal give the King a dispensation for two wives than grant what the writer asked, but not knowing whether this would suit His Majesty, they had better to speak to the point. The Pope, however, continued to speak of the King's having two wives, and found several difficulties, especially that the Emperor would never consent to it."¹¹

Now a careful comparison of these three statements will make it evident that they cannot all be perfectly accurate, and that

⁷ *Letters and Papers*, IV, 4977. See also quotation from Harpsfield in Lewis' *Sander*, p. cxxvi.

⁸ *Letters and Papers*, IV, 1552.

⁹ Letter in *English Historical Review*.

¹⁰ *Letters and Papers*, IV, iii., 3023.

¹¹ *Letters and Papers*, IV, iii., 3189.

the truest account of what really happened is that given by Dr. Benet. This is really easily understandable. Somehow or other the Pope had come to learn of Henry's suggestion that he should be allowed to have two wives. This raised an interesting question. Polygamy had been definitely allowed in Old Testament times. Was it absolutely forbidden under all circumstances in the New Testament, or could the Pope grant a dispensation in a very exceptional case? One theologian—apparently Cardinal Cajetan¹³—thought this was within the Papal power. It must be borne in mind in this connection, that while the Profession of Faith required from Michael Palaeologus by Gregory X, at the Second Council of Lyons in 1274, asserted that "The Holy Roman Church holds and teaches that neither is one man allowed to have several wives at the same time, nor one woman several husbands,"¹³ it may not then have been perfectly clear that the law was so absolute as to admit of no dispensation whatever.¹⁴ Hence the Pope may have wondered whether such a dispensation lay within the Papal power, and to settle the matter, he put the question to the Congregation of Cardinals, who, however, at once made it clear that the Pope had no such power, and he informed the English envoy accordingly.

It is surely significant that though Pollard and Lindsay both give a footnote reference to this despatch by Dr. Benet, they discreetly abstain from making any use whatever of it in their text. As to Dr. Cadoux, we may suppose that he has not troubled to look up the originals at all.

Such is the real history of these supposed Papal dispensations for bigamy. Father Joyce is certainly not exaggerating when, in his *Christian Marriage*, p. 572, note 2, he describes the whole matter as "a MARE'S NEST." The credit of re-discovering this ornithological impossibility must be attributed to Dr. Cadoux.

¹³ See Pastor, *History of the Popes*, Vol. X, p. 276.

¹³ Denzinger: *Encheiridion*, 465.

¹⁴ The Council of Trent settled the question once for all by the following Canon, passed in 1563: "If anyone shall say it is lawful for Christians to have several wives at the same time, and that this is not prohibited by any Divine Law, let him be anathema." (Session XXIV, Canon 2.)

ALBERTA AND AFTER

BY THE REV. F. H. DRINKWATER.

THE chief protection of the Money-power ever since the War has been a long conspiracy of silence on the part of the Press, both about the Money-power itself and about the complete exposure of it which has taken place. This conspiracy of silence has now been broken through by an Event—the election-result in Alberta. The news and comment about it in the English papers have been fairly plentiful though not always well informed, and the average person who has been hitherto protected from all knowledge of social credit ideas is naturally puzzled. Has a whole province of Canadian farmers gone mad, or what?

To realize the significance of Alberta we must understand that practically the whole electorate (on a poll huge beyond all precedent) voted for a social credit policy: Mr. Aberhart's party won fifty-six seats out of the total of sixty-three, but the defeated Government party was equally pledged to take steps towards introducing social credit, though in a more cautious fashion, and even the Liberals, who secured most of the few remaining seats, had promised a Government Enquiry into Social Credit.

Conceivably the political revolution of Alberta may spread rapidly over other parts of Canada, even perhaps in time to affect the federal elections of this October. Political revolution is a fair description of what has happened in Alberta: for the first time in any part of the world popular attention has fixed itself upon the money-system as the urgent thing that needs to be put right, has thrown out all orthodox politicians without any exception, and put into power a number of ordinary plain citizens.

Until about three years ago, social credit in Alberta was in much the same position as in other English-speaking countries—a smouldering propaganda of a few enthusiastic little intelligentsia-groups that had resulted from the first Orage-Douglas campaign of the early nineteen-twenties. Then, about three years ago apparently, it came to the notice of Mr. William Aberhart. He was an elderly schoolmaster turned evangelical preacher, and he had already attracted a large number of extremely devoted disciples by his lectures on the Scriptures. From his Prophetic Biblical Institute his lectures were broadcast in a special radio-hour, and his followers increased in numbers accordingly. His methods and ideas seem to have developed parallel to those of Fr. Coughlin in Detroit, but what influence, if any, they may have had on each other, I cannot

guess. At any rate Mr. Aberhart discovered "Douglas Social Credit" and showed his individuality and common sense by neglecting the needless and sometimes unreal complications of its practical proposals, and seizing upon the two main principles that really matter—the assertion that money and credit ought to be controlled in the interest of the community instead of being a private monopoly, and the demand that special issues of credit should be made direct to consumers as such. He translated these principles into a practical scheme of his own, more realistic than any of the Douglas proposals, and summed up in the satisfying slogan of "Twenty-five dollars a month for all citizens over twenty-one"; and plunged into a Christian-social-justice crusade with a view to the Provincial elections.

So evidently successful was his appeal that the party in power (United Farmers' Party) felt obliged to adopt a social-credit programme themselves. With the rather-too-obvious aim of dishing Mr. Aberhart, the Provincial Government invited Major Douglas to come out to Alberta as their duly appointed economic adviser. He went there in the early part of this year, and produced a quiet and sensible Report as to certain preliminary safeguards that would have to be taken by Alberta if Alberta intended to attempt the difficult task of starting a Social-Credit régime on its own. He did his best to remain neutral and non-committal about Mr. Aberhart's brand of social credit, though he is said to have declared (under pressure from the United Farmers' Party) that the Aberhart plan would not work; while the Social Credit Secretariat in London, which is supposed to represent the Major's views, condemned Mr. Aberhart outright as a heretic.

The landslide at the election seems to have surprised everyone even in Alberta. There was a certain amount of nervousness amongst the holders of Alberta securities, and one of Mr. Aberhart's first cares as Premier was to get a loan from the Federal Government in order to tide over the immediate financial embarrassments of the Province. Presumably he will now settle down to the task of putting his own programme into effect, which he expects to take fifteen months. Here, in his own words to the London *Daily Mail*, is what Mr. Aberhart proposes to do:—

"Every man and woman in the province—from millionaire to unemployed farm labourer—will be given each month by the State credit valued at £5.

"This basic dividend will be sufficient to secure each individual citizen the bare necessities of food, clothing and shelter.

"Dividends will not be paid in money but in the form of credit, in much the same way as banks issue many loans at the present time.

"Each citizen will be given a dividend book and a book of blank non-negotiable certificates. Each month he will present

his dividend book at a branch of the 'State Credit House,' when the credit entry of £5 will be made.

"His wages, if any—paid to him in certificates—will also be entered on the credit side. When he wishes to purchase goods or services he will merely fill out a certificate for the amount and hand it to the creditor, who must deposit it at the branch 'State Credit House' and not transfer it.

"You are going to ask me how we recover the value of the dividends?

"That's quite simple. We make a levy on 'unearned increment'—which is simply the difference between the cost of production and the price charged to the consumer.

"With increased turnover producers and distributors will be able to carry on with a closer margin of profit.

"The province will therefore be able to collect by levy to provide the dividends.

"The levy will be taken at every stage of the 'processed' article. For instance, a levy made on the farmer selling wheat to the miller, on the miller selling flour to the baker, and on the baker selling bread to the consumer.

"A commission of experts will settle a 'just price' for all articles, which will give the producer, importer and distributor a fair commission, but will not exploit the purchasing power of the consumer. This will prevent any inflation.

"All credit in the State Credit House—whether basic dividends, wages, salaries, or any kind of income—must be expended by the end of the year following its receipt. . . .

"A man wishing to pay an 'outside' account would buy at a post office or State Credit House a money order on the external place from which the goods came. This money order would be paid for by certificate, and when it was cashed by the creditor the debt would be transferred to the Alberta Government and become part of the actual balance of trade."

Since this interview, Mr. Aberhart has declared that if the branch-banks in Alberta are allowed to co-operate with the Government, the dividends may be paid in money instead of certificates.

Will the Alberta plan be allowed to succeed? Will it even be allowed to be tried? Humanly speaking, its chances are nil. Almost everything in the world that has any power will be arrayed against it, either openly or secretly. The truth about it will be distorted, the persons responsible for it slandered, opposition engineered. If it succeeds, it will be rather a miracle.

Nevertheless, even if it does fail, the results will have been very great. The effects outside Alberta are already visible. The Canadian Premier (who, curiously enough sits in the Federal

Parliament for Calgary West in Alberta) is now travelling the Dominion with promises to reduce loan-interest and to "correct Capitalism." In England, as already remarked, Alberta has awakened the public mind for the first time to the possibility of a money-system without usury. In other parts of the British Commonwealth the Alberta example may soon bear fruit, and notably in New Zealand, which for various reasons is looked upon as one of the most favourably situated countries for inaugurating a social credit régime.

Another interesting consequence of the Alberta election is likely to be the effect of it on the Douglas movement. The Douglasites in this country have celebrated the Alberta result as a victory for Social Credit in general, and are taking it for granted that now he is in power, Mr. Aberhart will see the error of his own election-programme and will send at once for Major Douglas, and follow whatever advice the Major offers him. To the unprejudiced observer it seems just as likely that the Douglasites will have to modify their own doctrines in the direction of the Aberhart plan. Major Douglas himself, one imagines, would have little or no difficulty in making such a change. Indeed, he was already saying on September 1st: "I have no cut-and-dried plan which I should apply in all countries or circumstances. I have an *objective*—the freeing of credit from the control of the bankers and its equitable distribution among the people to whom it rightly belongs." If Major Douglas decides that he can give his approval after all to this Alberta heresy, then the true Douglasites will follow him with blind obedience, for many of them have come to regard the Major much as Matthew Arnold regarded Shakespeare:

" Others abide our question : thou art free,
O'er-topping knowledge !"

Even before the Alberta election there was a lively "development of doctrine" going on within the Douglas movement, one side saying that a Social Credit government would have somehow to cancel (withdraw from circulation) the consumer-dividends as fast as they were issued and spent, and the other side—chiefly the "old originals"—denying this strongly. Strange that so crucial a question should have been left undefined for fifteen years, and that even now Major Douglas himself should prefer not to give a decision! So it is, anyhow; but the Alberta plan (which, of course, includes cancellation) will force the issue for the theorists. The Douglas groups (which form a compact, well-organized and hard-working movement) will have to choose between adapting themselves to reality and new circumstances, or becoming the mere discarded egg-shell out of which the real social credit chicken will have been born.

I believe they will make the right choice. It is to be hoped so, for they are the only serious organized force working in England for the abolition of poverty through socialized-credit.

HOMILETICS

BY THE REV. T. E. BIRD, Ph.D., D.D.

Twenty-first Sunday after Pentecost.

We are not wrong in saying that sermons on the Devil and his evil spirits are not so common to-day as they were aforetime. This is to be regretted. For the greatest victory that Satan has won over the modern world is in getting himself and the next world unrecognized and unknown. In modern warfare camouflage plays an important part, and the Devil is a master of camouflage. "He is a liar, and the father thereof";¹ and his deceptions have wrought havoc from the beginning until now.

Of the three great enemies of our souls the most terrible is Satan. The World and the Flesh are visible, material, tangible: the Devil is invisible, spiritual and intangible. He has the subtlety of a fallen archangel.² Small wonder then that St. Paul, in to-day's epistle, tells us that we need "the armour of God" in order that we may be able to stand against the deceits of the devil. And the "wrestling" is not with a single opponent; there is a host of hostile beings who are bent on making us fall—"principalities" and "powers," "rulers of the world of this darkness," "spirits of wickedness" who infest the air about us. What a dreadful thought! All around us are invisible devils playing havoc with human souls that allow themselves to come under their influence. The sacred Apostles would have the early Christians (and us) be under no delusion as to the power of Satan. St. Peter likens him to "a roaring lion going about seeking whom he may devour."³ St. John records our Lord's name for the Fiend, "the prince of this world."⁴ St. Paul has a more awful expression, "the god of this age."⁵ A colossal amount of the world's sin is due to Satan's working; but his power is not confined to sin. He can tempt every soul; he had the effrontery to tempt Christ Himself. He can hinder good being done: he prevented St. Paul from visiting the Thessalonians.⁶ He can cause physical infirmity:

¹ John viii. 44.

² At one of the apparitions of the demon to Père Lamy, the saintly priest greeted him with "Ah! dirty beast"; but the archangel Gabriel told him not to forget that Lucifer is a fallen archangel (*Apôtre et Mystique le Père Lamy*, p. 155).

³ 1 Peter, v. 8.

⁴ John xii. 31; xiv. 30; xvi. 11.

⁵ 2 Cor. iv. 4.

⁶ 1 Thes. ii. 18.

"this daughter of Abraham, whom Satan hath bound, lo these eighteen years."⁷

The best example of this last mischief is that which is written in the inspired book which is *ex professo* a revelation to us of the invisible power of the fallen archangel—the *Book of Job*. And this twenty-first Sunday after Pentecost is the day when we should learn the lesson of that book, for at the Offertory at Mass the Church bids us read :

There was a man in the land of Hus, whose name was Job, simple and upright, and fearing God : whom Satan besought that he might tempt : and power was given him from the Lord over his possessions and his flesh ; and he destroyed all his substance and his children ; and also wounded his flesh with a grievous ulcer.

Let us turn to the Book itself. Job of the land of Hus had a fine family of seven sons and three daughters. He was a wealthy man—not in stocks and shares, but in flocks and herds, whereby wealth was computed in those days. He was a man of great repute ; he was also a religious man, saying his prayers and offering his sacrifices. Spiritually and materially the man was well set. But the day came when he was brought to utter ruin. Why? He had not the slightest idea himself. He was sorely perplexed and could not understand it. Why had God allowed calamity after calamity to oppress him, grief after grief to gnaw at his heart? Job does not know. But the inspired writer tells us.

The second scene shows Satan, the fallen archangel, boasting before God that he has gone the length and breadth of the world and brought all men under his sway. God reminds him of "my servant Job"; to which Satan retorts that it is easy enough for a man to be religious when he has all that his heart can desire in wealth and success. Permission is then given to Satan to bring financial ruin on the holy man and to cause the death of all his children. Immortal words are born of this havoc and bereavement :

Naked came I out of my mother's womb,
And naked shall I return thither.
The Lord gave,
And the Lord hath taken away.
As it hath pleased the Lord
So is it done.
Blessed be the name of the Lord.

Again the scene is changed—Satan again bragging before God. And when he is reminded of Job "still keeping his innocence," he finds a pretext in that the man has still health and strength. "Skin for skin, and all that a man hath he will give for his life!" Then God permits the affliction of the terrible ulcer "from the sole of the foot to the top of the head"; and the once

⁷ Luke xiii. 16.

healthy, wealthy and highly esteemed citizen leaves his home, goes outside the walls of the town to the smouldering refuse-heap, and taking a potsherd scrapes the matter from his sores. His wife follows him, but only to make insulting remarks on his religion. Again we meet immortal words :

If we have received good things from the hand of God,
Why should we not receive evil?

His friends come to express their sympathy, but only to go down in history as "Job's Comforters." He begs (in vain) for their sympathy :

Have pity on me!
Have pity on me!
At least you my friends,
Because the hand of the Lord hath touched me!

But the important point is that neither Job nor his "friends" know why he is afflicted. The poor sufferer can only cry out :

I know that my Redeemer liveth⁸
and express his faith in the Beatific Vision after death.

So we learn from this sublime *Book of Job* that much evil is caused in the world by a fallen archangel; and that we shall not understand his working of "the mystery of iniquity" until we have passed from this life. Meanwhile it behoves us to remember that our wrestling is not so much against mortal men as against invisible foes. The first man was a victim of Satan's deception and the last men will be terribly seduced by him.⁹ Even an Apostle was woefully ensnared: "and after the morsel, Satan entered into him."¹⁰ None of us can hope to escape his temptations.

Temptations from the world and the flesh are fairly easily recognized—the pride of life and concupiscence. But Satan's temptations are more astute. They are usually against faith or religion or perseverance in doing good. We see this in the case of Adam and Eve (tempted to renounce their allegiance to God), and of Job (tempted to give up his religion). He attacked the Jewish priesthood,¹¹ and he would shake the faith of the first Christian priests as in a sieve.¹² Those Christians whose faith is superficial are soon robbed of it entirely.¹³ Small wonder that

⁸ The "Redeemer" is not Christ, but the *go'el*, the Vindicator, who in this passage is God Himself. As the words in xix. 26 almost certainly (in the original) contain no reference to the resurrection of the body, the preacher will refrain from drawing an argument in this sense from them. Certainly, however, Job believes in the Vision of God after death, but if this means the Beatific Vision, we know that it could not come until after the Redemption.

⁹ 2 Thes. ii. 3-11.

¹⁰ John xiii. 27.

¹¹ Zach. iii. 1.

¹² Luke xxii. 31.

¹³ Mark iv. 15.

he should lie in wait for Mary and her Child, and be enraged against "the rest of her seed, who keep the commandments of God and have the testimony of Jesus Christ."¹⁴

Against Satan and his invisible hosts mere human strength is unavailing. We need supernatural aid. Thank God, the angels that fell not, are ready to help us if we invoke them, especially St. Michael, the champion against Satan. With deep earnestness we need to recite the prayer after Mass: "Cast down to hell Satan and all wicked spirits, who wander through the world for the ruin of souls."

Twenty-second Sunday after Pentecost.

In to-day's Gospel we have one of those questions put to Our Lord by His enemies in order to label Him a partisan of conflicting interests. They thought that they were clever; but on each occasion they were silenced by the wisdom of the Son of God. Never did He answer as they thought He *must*.

The earlier questions were rather murmurings or complaints: "Why do you eat with publicans and sinners?", "Why do you do that which is not lawful on the Sabbath Day?", "Why do not your disciples fast, like John's?", "Why do they take their meals without first washing their hands?", "Give us a sign from heaven", "By what authority?"¹⁵ Later came the questions designed to entrap Him, to make Him a partisan: "Moses in the Law commanded us to stone such a one (adulteress). But what sayest thou?" ("Are you for or against the Law?"); "Whose wife shall she be?" asked the Sadducees, putting a poser that Pharisees had been unable to answer; but His answer silenced the Sadducees, and at the same time showed how His teaching was far above that of the Pharisaical schools—in the next life, no husbands and wives but only children of God, equal to the angels. Some of the Scribes that were listening could not conceal their admiration at this unexpected reply. "Master," they said, "thou hast said well!" Again, the Pharisees would find out whether He sided with Hillel or Shammai on the divorce question: "Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?" But He was neither for Hillel nor Shammai. Going back beyond Moses and the disputed divorce text He reminded them that "from the beginning it was not so." Here even the disciples are staggered: "If the case of a man with his wife be so, it is not expedient to marry!"¹⁶

But the question of paying the tribute was the most cunning of all (as became evident at the Trial); for it was a political trap set to catch Him as an enemy either of Caesar or of the Jewish nationalist party. Indeed, we are here told of a deep conspiracy. For, according to St. Mark, the deputation is sent from

¹⁴ Gen. iii. 15, with *Apoc.* xii. 4, 13-17.

¹⁵ E.g. Mark ii. 16; iii. 2; ii. 18; vii. 5; viii. 11; xi. 28.

¹⁶ John viii. 5; Luke xx. 33; Matt. xix. 3.

the supreme Jewish authority—the Sanhedrin; the deputation itself consists of Pharisees (who “consulted among themselves,” that is, carefully thought out the plot) and Herodians (the politicians supporting the Herodian dynasty); and they have prepared speech which they think will throw Him off His guard: “Master, we know that thou art a true (i.e., straightforward) speaker, and teachest the Way of God in truth,” etc. Indeed, in spite of His magnificent answer, which simply nonplussed them, we know how they later determined that the plot should achieve its object even at the cost of lying: “We have found this man . . . forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar.”¹⁷

From another incident we know how careful Our Lord was to respect the just laws (and to teach us to respect such laws) of the government in power. A tax collector met Peter in a street at Capharnaum and asked whether his Master paid the Temple Tax. Peter was able to reply that his Master always paid the tax. Jesus met Peter coming into the house and put to him a question that showed that He knew exactly what had taken place: “What is thy opinion, Simon? The kings of the earth, of whom do they receive tribute or custom? Of their own children, or of strangers?” Peter answered: “Of strangers.” Jesus said: “Then the children are free.” The meaning is obvious. Only about a week before, Peter had made his splendid confession: “Thou art the Christ, the *Son of the Living God*.” As Jesus was the Son of the King of Heaven, He had no need to pay a tax levied for the support of His Father’s House. But to avoid scandal Peter is bidden “go to the sea and cast in a hook and that fish which shall first come up, take: and when thou hast opened its mouth, thou shalt find a stater. Take that and give to them for me and thee.”¹⁸

Nowadays the danger is not one of neglecting to pay Cæsar his dues, but of paying him too much; indeed, of handing over to him what belongs to God. We are witnessing a revival of Cæsar-worship, of the deification of the State, of the belittling or denial of divine and natural law for the supremacy of civil or municipal law. Carried to its conclusion the Totalitarian State renders to Cæsar what does not belong to Cæsar. And even in States that have not adopted the totalitarian principle, the encroachment on God’s domain steals steadily onward. As it ousts God more and more, democracy changes to demonocracy. Finding the place swept and garnished Satan enters in. Startlingly short is the time during which State divorce, State control of education, the establishment of birth control clinics and other evils have grown like weeds in our midst. No Catholic can say that these things do not concern him; he cannot look on indifferently (especially in a democracy) while the things that belong to God are being handed over to Cæsar. The early Christians could be proud of Roman citizenship, but they suffered

¹⁷ Luke xxiii. 2.

¹⁸ Matt. xvii. 23 ff. The connection between this incident and xvi. 17 ff. is often overlooked by commentators.

death rather than offer the incense to the Emperor. Our glorious martyr, Saint Thomas of Canterbury, loved his country dearly; but he was ready to embrace death "for the Name of Jesus and the protection of the Church." His brains and blood were scattered on the pavement of Canterbury Cathedral, and one of the murderers cried to his companions: "Let us be off, knights; he will rise no more";¹⁹ but he *did* rise again—as a bulwark against Cæsarism for more than three centuries in Europe. When the monster raised its head again at the end of that time another Saint Thomas went to the scaffold declaring himself: "the king's good and loyal servant, but God's first." May the example of these two martyrs stimulate us to refuse to Cæsar the things that are God's.

Twenty-third Sunday after Pentecost.

St. Paul probably has in mind the Judaisers when he speaks of those "whose god is their belly, and whose glory is in their shame"; for these people demanded distinctions between foods and the circumcision of the body as essential to religion. We know what a trouble "this party of the circumcision"²⁰ was to both St. Peter and St. Paul. They would have all Christians come into the Church through the vestibule of the Mosaic ceremonial law. Had they gained their point, we to-day should all have to undergo circumcision before Baptism. They contended that circumcision was necessary for salvation. Thank God, "it hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to Us" to lay no such burden on Christians. But even the solemn definition of the Council did not silence at least some of these Judaisers. In fact they seem to have gone from bad to worse, and to have attempted time after time to induce St. Paul's converts to embrace a form of religion that was more Jewish than Christian.

But leaving aside the errors of these first heretics we may give a wider interpretation to St. Paul's words; for they apply to all who "are enemies of the cross of Christ" and "who mind earthly things."

Now the whole business of the devout Christian is to raise his mind above earthly things. Hence the Apostle continues: "But our conversation is in heaven." We are to look "not at the things that are seen, but at the things that are not seen: for the things that are seen are temporal; but the things that are not seen are eternal."²¹ Our business is to lift up our eyes to the mountains, yea, beyond the mountains to the God who made the mountains and who made heaven and earth. Thence shall our help come. For there is "the Saviour, Our Lord Jesus Christ, who will reform the body of our lowness, made like to the body of his glory, according to the operation whereby also he is able to subdue all things unto himself."

¹⁹ See the account of Edward Grim, who was an eye-witness of the murder.

²⁰ Acts xi. 2. 3; xv.

²¹ 2 Cor. iv. 18.

O noble destiny of our poor bodies! How exalted is to be the clay of which we are formed! Brother ass is to be "reformed" indeed, aye, transformed to wondrous dignity. We know from the Scriptures what the body of Christ's glory was like; or, at least, how the Apostles were unable to look at Him transfigured. but "fell upon their face and were very much afraid"; and how that same fear overpowered them when He came to them through closed doors after the Resurrection. Yet our own lowly bodies are to partake of that same glory. "The body indeed of Christ is glorified by the glory of His divinity, and this it merited by the Passion. Everyone, therefore, who participates in the virtue of His divinity by grace, and imitates the Passion of Christ, will be glorified," says St. Thomas Aquinas;²³ and he quotes the texts: "To him that shall overcome, I will give to sit with me in my throne: as I also have overcome and am set down with my Father in his throne;²⁴ we shall be like to him;²⁴ then shall the just shine as the sun in the kingdom of their Father."²⁵ We cannot do better than follow his exposition to the end. It continues: "And this He does according to the operation of His divinity, that is, by the power in Himself whereby He is able to subject all things to Himself. For all will be made subject to Christ; some by salvation, others by punishment. He will exercise mercy on the former, justice on the latter."

If, therefore, our bodies are destined for so noble a state, with what respect, with what reverence should they be treated during mortal life! What a desecration to make a god of the belly, and to glory in doing shameful things! Verily, they that do these things are enemies of the Cross of Christ and their end is destruction. They take their standards and fashion from the world; they disdain the model set by St. Paul, which was after the model of Christ. He counted worldly attractions as dung in order that he might gain Christ. But they prefer the concupiscence of the flesh and the concupiscence of the eyes and the pride of life. He was crucified to the world and the world to him: they seek the friendship of the world which is the enemy of God; for whosoever will be a friend of this world becometh an enemy of God.²⁶ Sheer stupidity then on the part of a Christian to think that he can follow both the fashion of this world and the fashion of St. Paul, which was that of Christ.²⁷

We need these salutary truths in these days when the doctrines of Aristippus and his Hedonist School are being revived; when

²³ *Expositio super Epist. ad Phil.* ad loc.

²⁴ Apoc. iii. 21.

²⁴ 1 John iii. 2.

²⁵ Matt. xiii. 43.

²⁶ Phil. iii. 8; 1 John ii. 16; Gal. vi. 14; James iv. 4.

²⁷ 1 Cor. iv. 16; xi. 1.

there is a feverish quest for worldly pleasures, when the body is debased from its dignity. The Catholic Church is no puritanical kill-joy; a reasonable and moderate amount of pleasure is never sinful, indeed sometimes it is necessary, and, consequently, pleasing to God. Yet we know that pleasure merely for pleasure's sake is sinful; that we cannot do things "simply for the fun of the thing" to the exclusion of a reasonable purpose. Pope Innocent XI, in 1679, condemned the proposition that to eat and drink to repletion for pleasure alone is not a sin provided that health is not damaged; and also the teaching that sexual intercourse between husband and wife merely for pleasure's sake is without fault or venial sin. Let us have then what recreation and pleasure our poor bodies require under the dictates of right reason; but let us avoid the company of worldlings—those that are impure, cheats, railers, drunkards, extortioners, "with such, not so much as to eat."²⁸ In fine we must use this world as if not using it; for the fashion of this world passeth away.²⁹ Thereby shall our names be inscribed with those of Paul, Clement, and "the rest of my fellow-workers" in that most important of all books—a book not merely of souls, but of souls and bodies awaiting glorification—the Book of Life.

The Last Sunday after Pentecost.

On the last Sunday of her year, holy Mother the Church bids us turn our thoughts to the end of all things on earth, the end of the world. So important, indeed, does she consider the memory of this truth that she returns to it again on the first Sunday of her liturgical year.

Science tells us that the world must come to an end. It speaks of the sun giving less and less of its radiation until life is frozen off the earth. But what neither physics nor astronomy can teach us can be learnt with infallible truth from the pages of Holy Writ. There we are told that the end will come *suddenly* and when men are not at all expecting it. Precisely when men are saying: "Peace and Security," when they think that all's well with the world, even then the catastrophe will be upon them, sudden as the birth-pang upon the woman with child, and no one shall escape.³⁰ Then will the great ones of the earth who have proclaimed this "Peace and Security"—kings, the great men and military leaders, the rich and the strong—hide themselves in caves and among mountain rocks; "and they will say to the mountains and to the rocks: 'Fall upon us and hide us from the face of him that sitteth upon the throne and from the wrath of the Lamb, for the great day of their wrath is come, and who shall be able to stand.'"³¹

²⁸ 1 Cor. v. 11.

²⁹ *Ibid.* vii. 31.

³⁰ 1 Thess. v. 3.

³¹ *Apoc.* vi. 15-17.

At His first coming Christ appeared in humble state—in a manger of a stable. Not so the second coming. Then in majestic array from heaven, “as you have seen him going to heaven,”³² accompanied by all His angels, and with sudden brilliance, “as lightning cometh out of the east and appeareth even into the west.” It behoves us therefore to be on the watch, lest, “coming on a sudden,” He finds us sleeping.³³ Indeed, when He described these things to the Apostles He addressed us directly: “What I say to you, *I say to all*: Watch.”

Not surprising is it then to find that the great Watchmen of the Church, the bishops, have warned the faithful to be ready even in their life-time for the Day of the Lord. Not without good reason are the homilies of St. Leo the Great and St. Gregory the Great appointed to be read on the first Sunday of Advent. Our own Archbishop of Westminster has wisely spoken in similar strain.³⁴

As a type of those last days of the New Law Our Lord foretells the last days of the Old Covenant—the destruction of Jerusalem and of its Temple. The Gospel to-day offers an example of that “compenetration” of prophecy which is not unusual in Sacred Scripture—type overlapping anti-type and vice-versa. To select one detail, we draw attention to “the abomination of desolation which was spoken of by Daniel the prophet.” Daniel speaks of three distinct “abominations,” and yet the first is the type of the second, and these two the type of the third. The first was when Antiochus transformed God’s Temple at Jerusalem into a temple of Olympian Zeus, and endeavoured to abolish the Jewish religion by the death penalty.³⁵ Now this could not be the “abomination” of which Our Lord speaks, because it took place nearly one hundred and seventy years before He was born. He warns His disciples: “*When you shall see the abomination.*” Turning, therefore, back to Daniel we find him combining an “abomination of desolation” with the opening of a reign of everlasting justice, when prophecy shall be fulfilled and sin taken away. Evidently this is a picture of Messianic times.³⁶ This abomination took place when Jerusalem was compassed about by the Roman army,³⁷ the city destroyed and not a stone of the magnificent Temple left upon a stone. It was

³² Acts i. 11.

³³ Mark xiii. 36.

³⁴ “The present is not promising and the future is uncertain. Races are rising against races, black against white, and the yellow against both. Everything is disturbing, and the world is in a crisis. The world is passing through a period of dissension, I might almost say of dissolution.” (Quoted in *The Universe*, August 2nd, 1935, p. 24.)

³⁵ 1 Machabees i; 2 Machabees vi. 4-7. The prophet Daniel spoke of this in viii. 13; xi. 31. On the whole question see Billot *La Parousie*, pp. 105 ff.

³⁶ Dan. ix. 24-27.

³⁷ Cf. Luke xxi. 20.

to this abomination that Our Lord referred in His discourse. But not exclusively so. For even the abomination of desolation brought about by Titus was but the type of a more terrible one. We turn back to Daniel the prophet and we find that he speaks of this third abomination which he cannot understand. The book is shut up and sealed.³⁸ Here the full meaning (as St. Jerome pointed out) can only be to the end of the world. When the perpetual sacrifice of the Mass is taken away, then indeed will be the culminating abomination of desolation.

Another phrase that is vague and obscure to the lay reader on this Sunday is: "Wheresoever the body shall be, there shall the eagles also be gathered together." Obviously Our Lord is using a proverb well known to His disciples;³⁹ but its application has given rise to many interpretations.⁴⁰ In all probability the eagles are the just who have fed on the Body and Blood of Christ. At His coming they will be carried in the air to meet Him.⁴¹ No need to tell them: "Lo, here is Christ, or there"; for they will at once recognize Him Who four times in a short Eucharistic discourse, said: "I will raise him up at the last day." The best preparation then for the Last Day is the frequent reception of the Body and Blood of Christ. It is our bounden duty to be on the alert lest that Day come in our own time. Should we not witness that great tribulation yet most assuredly our own last day on earth will come. We have His own solemn promise that if we worthily receive His Body and Blood, He will raise us up at the Last Day.⁴²

³⁸ Dan. xii.

³⁹ See Job xxxix. 30.

⁴⁰ Partially due to the use of two different words, *ptoma* (Matt.) and *soma* (Luke).

⁴¹ 1 Thes. iv. 6.

⁴² John vi. 39, 40, 44, 55.

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

I. DOGMATIC THEOLOGY.

BY THE REV. GEORGE D. SMITH, Ph.D., D.D.

To every student of dogmatic theology, and in a special degree to those who would treat it from the standpoint of the apologist, some knowledge of the science of Comparative Religion¹ is becoming increasingly necessary. The theologian, it is true, needs no such study to assist him in his investigation of the content of Christian revelation. He has his sources—inspired Scripture and divinely assisted Tradition—from which he derives all his knowledge of revealed truth, and the history of other religions can teach him nothing more concerning the religion of Christ than is contained within the *depositum fidei*. Nevertheless, the study of human gropings after truth may well make him wonder both at the power of the mind of man who, even though unaided by revelation, is still “little less than the angels,” and at the unfailing guidance of the Providence of God who throughout the vicissitudes of centuries has not allowed the vestiges of His primitive revelation to be entirely lost. Even more fruitful in their lesson are the aberrations of the human intellect in its search for divine truth; for the story of these cannot but teach us to appreciate still more the unity, the truth, the goodness and the beauty of the religion which Christ has revealed.

But it is especially the apologist who needs nowadays to concentrate upon the study of Comparative Religion. It is the contention of many who are learned in this branch of historical research that Christianity is nothing but a syncretism, a growth to which all forms of religion have in their measure contributed. For such authors the study of the Christian religion resolves itself merely into an analysis of its component elements, a calculation of the influence, manifested in this or that Christian belief or practice, of Judaism or paganism, of the oriental or the Greek religions, or of the mystery-cults of the Greco-Roman period. Proceeding by the method of analogies and parallels they seek to show that the chief dogmas of the Christian religion—monotheism, the Trinity, creation, redemption, the sacraments—all find their counterpart, perfect or imperfect, in the non-Christian religions. These dogmas are thus made to enter into the scheme of a natural evolution of religious thought, the whole structure of Christian doctrine being regarded, at best as the highest stage yet reached in that natural development,

¹ *Studies in Comparative Religion*, to be completed in five volumes; edited by Rev. E. C. Messenger, Ph.D. (C.T.S.) 3/- a volume.

or, at worst—so far as Catholic theology at least is concerned—as an adulteration of the pure teaching of Jesus Christ. Indeed, the teaching of Christ himself is not immune from criticism at the hands of these historians. He, like all men, having suffered from the limitations of His period and environment.

Such being the outlook of many of those who have devoted themselves to the study of comparative religion it is not surprising that the science itself was for some time regarded by certain Catholics with suspicion; so many weapons had been forged in it to cast doubt upon the supernatural character of the Christian revelation that they thought it safer to leave it alone. This may have been the attitude of some individuals, but it has never been the attitude of the Catholic Church. Any synthesis of knowledge which merits the name of science is regarded by her as at least ancillary to the greatest of all sciences—theology—which treats of man's relations with God as set forth in the Christian revelation. The Church therefore encourages all sciences, and among them not least that of Comparative Religion, whose object is so closely allied to that science which unifies and crowns them all.

Dr. Messenger, therefore, together with his twenty-six learned and distinguished collaborators, renders a signal service to theology and to apologetics as well as to the science of the history of religions by the *Studies in Comparative Religion* which he so ably edits for the Catholic Truth Society. Only three of the five volumes contemplated have already appeared, but they suffice to show that we have here a valuable contribution to English religious literature. Those who have attempted to edit a complete series of volumes contributed by many different authors will best appreciate the difficulties which the General Editor of these *Studies* has so successfully surmounted: the scientific division of the subject into convenient and manageable sections; the selection and (what is often more difficult) the securing of the right contributors, and finally (what is usually most difficult of all) the early securing of their contributions. In all these tasks Dr. Messenger has been respectively successful, discriminating and fortunate. He himself contributes to the first volume a most useful introductory essay in which, after a provisional definition of religion (provisional at this stage because an essential definition presupposes the completion of the study) we are given a general classification of the various types of religion. The essay concludes with an excellent and most important section on Comparative Religion as a Science, in which the author briefly, but none the less clearly and forcibly, lays down the principles which should guide the Catholic in his study of Comparative religion. These are so well put, and are so pertinent to the timorous attitude to which I have referred above that a few of his sentences may usefully be quoted: "It is not suggested," writes Dr. Messenger, "that Catholic writers on Comparative Religion have always been free from these faults" (e.g., failure to distinguish between fact and

hypothesis). "But at any rate we can claim that there is nothing in Catholic Philosophy or Theology which need affect our honest and objective endeavour to establish the real facts of Comparative Religion. . . . A Catholic does not accept either philosophical or theological truths because these can be established by the Science of Comparative Religion. Hence he is not discomfited if the facts as known fail to establish any particular truth which he happens to hold, on philosophical or theological grounds. Therefore, he is in no way compelled to stress or strain the evidence available. . . . The second reason why Catholics can be quite impartial in their study of the facts is their firm belief—for it is an article of faith—that no fact can ever be discovered which will in any way conflict with a defined doctrine. Catholics are convinced that all truth comes from God, and that truth cannot contradict truth. Moreover, they hold, with St. Albert the Great, that the truths of natural knowledge constitute a real revelation of and from God. Therefore, they study the facts of this natural revelation with avidity, certain that, as there is only one God, so also there can be only one truth. That is the profound conviction of the present writer, and of all who are collaborating with him in the present series of 'Studies in Comparative Religion.'"

In all his contributors the Editor has been fortunate, but in none, perhaps, more fortunate than in Dr. W. Schmidt, the recognized authority, who writes on "The Religion of Earliest Man" and on "The Religion of Later Primitive Peoples." Those who are acquainted with his great work on *Origin and Growth of Religion* will appreciate the erudition which goes to make these two essays, comprising in all no more than sixty pages, an invaluable outline of this most important subject. Dr. Messenger has also happily secured the services of the indefatigable Fr. Martindale, whose interest in Comparative Religion and authority on the subject are of long standing; he it was who edited the earlier series of pamphlets for the Catholic Truth Society on the History of Religions. To the present series he contributes articles on the religions of Ancient Greece, Early Rome and Imperial Rome, as well as a masterly outline of the teaching of Christ, under the title "Jesus of Nazareth," and a closely packed but eminently clear account of that same teaching as echoed in "The Apostolic Church."

The authority of Dr. Barton on matters Biblical and Semitic is well known, and his work is familiar to readers of the *CLERGY REVIEW*. His contributions to the series on "The Religion of Israel" (Patriarchal and Mosaic Religion—The Religion of the Hebrew Prophets—The Religion of Post-exilic Judaism) combine an admirable compactness and clearness of expression with that erudition which his past work had led us to expect. Well known to our readers also is Fr. Philip Hughes, who contributes two excellent historical studies of "The Conversion of the Roman Empire" and "The Church in the Christian Roman Empire." Of all the papers which go to form this most

valuable collection there is not space to write. Let it suffice to say that each, equally with those that I have mentioned, is written by a specialist in his subject and is a worthy contribution to a series which every theologian and apologist will do well to possess.

II. MODERN CATHOLIC LITERATURE.

BY THE REV. S. J. GOSLING.

The aim of this *causerie* has been to give, from time to time, a critical survey of the state of literature which may be properly called Catholic and to estimate its importance in relation to the general output. For this purpose I have endeavoured to illustrate my remarks by commenting on books which can, for one reason or another, be taken as representing the Catholic mind or as expressing the Catholic reaction to those matters of thought or technique that engross the attention of men of letters. Such a comparison assumes a distinction between Catholic and non-Catholic literature which can be fairly easily recognized. We can, of course, adopt a rule of thumb and divide books according to the religious allegiance of their authors, calling one lot Catholic and the other non-Catholic, but such a grouping would result in some curious, not to say disedifying, anomalies. To make the comparison worth while a more subtle division must be employed—and a more debateable one, for as I have pointed out previously it is arguable whether such a thing as a definitely Catholic literature does, or can, exist. A Protestant literature, yes! because Protestantism is a matter of private judgment and the artist has the widest possible field for his self-expression. But the Catholic *ethos* is more strait-laced, and art, it is alleged, cannot flourish in bonds.

My reason for reopening the discussion is to be found in the little pile of books before me. The first, and the most fascinating, presupposes the existence of a Catholic literature for it is entitled *The Catholic Literary Revival*, by Calvert Alexander, S.J.¹ A first glance at the author's list of Catholic litterateurs might lead one to think that he had adopted too easily and applied too generously the rule that Catholic literature means literature written by Catholics. Beginning with Newman and Aubrey de Vere his third name is that of Robert Hawker, an Anglican parson who was received into the Church on his death-bed. That would seem to be stretching the definition rather far in one direction, and he makes it quite as elastic in an opposite direction by including Wilde, Beardsley and Dowson. A formula that can unite Newman and Wilde, Gerard Manley Hopkins and Ernest Dowson, Francis Thompson and Hilaire Belloc, looks too fantastically comprehensive to be of any value. And yet, reading these six, one is conscious of a common quality, an underlying thought, a philosophy of life, which separate

¹ Bruce Publishing Co. 115.

them from other writers by a gulf far wider than any difference among themselves. Father Alexander gives us the clue to this unity. In the first place, their universe is Christo-centric; they look neither to science nor to humanity for an explanation of the mystery of life. That is enough to set them apart from the materialism and the dying Romanticism of the nineteenth century. There is, however, something more; their centre is Christ, but the periphery of their vision is His Mystical Body. Here, if anywhere, we have the distinguishing mark of Catholicism. In dogma, in morals, in politics, in sociology, it gives the Catholic, to use an expressive modern word, *poise*. It is the doctrine first preached by St. Paul and in his hands it helped to form the living Church from the dead bones of paganism. It kept the Church of the Middle Ages free from the poison of Manicheism. In our own day it preserves us from the barrenness of a materialistic monism. But the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ is more than a defence against heresy; it is an incentive to action, and not on one plane alone but in every direction. It is, so to speak, the charter of the *Ecclesia docens*, the bond of its unity, and the explanation of the Church's hierarchical constitution. In the sphere of art it explains the asceticism of Hopkins, the gorgeous imagery and the liturgical inspiration of Francis Thompson, the intransigence of Chesterton and Belloc.

It does as much for the rank and file as it does for our leaders; it preserves our sanity. Dr. Inge (lest we should be thought to be over-praising ourselves) has recently confessed that Catholic people "are more sophisticated and perhaps better educated" than the Nordic Protestant type he loves so well. "They do not commit themselves to absurd fads." As a consequence we can preserve our balance in those gusty storms that sweep others into extremes of fanaticism. We can be, at one and the same time, strongly national with a true international outlook; we can be Socialists without a danger of becoming Communists; democrats using an aristocratic organization. In morals we fast because we like feasting, and fight because we love peace. These are some of the paradoxes which, particularly as handled by Mr. Chesterton, have so exasperated the modern philosopher. They are true paradoxes in the sense that their seeming contradictions conceal an essential truth. The Catholic *anima* is not disturbed, as is that of the Modern Churchman, by the disparate claims of reason and a teaching church. The Catholic can see that obedience can be the highest act of freedom. Nowhere is the difference between the Catholic and the modern pagan so evident as in Art, and particularly in that province of Art we call literature. "Christianity," says M. Jacques Maritain, "does not make art *easy*." Indeed, it does not—nor any other human activity that it touches. And the reason is that it consistently applies supernatural standards to natural achievements. Paganism takes the short view and with its superficial logic is often immediately successful. Its devotees bind them-

selves to a difficult stoicism for which they can give no adequate reason; or they follow the easier path of Pan and are lost in pathetic disillusionment. Of this company are the suicides—physical and moral. Some try to brazen it out—they are the muckrakers. To quote M. Maritain again: "Christianity deprives art of many facile means, it stops its progress in many directions." And it gives to the Christian artist the concept of sin. Father Alexander, referring to the number of decadents who joined the Church of Rome towards the end of the last century, says that at least they had one virtue, they called sin by its proper name. That was their salvation.

Such a criterion does more than merely enable us to distinguish Catholic from non-Catholic literature. It helps us to place Catholic men of letters in an order of merit that takes account of their moral integrity as well as their artistic gifts. We shall be told that this is to place morality above art. We need not be afraid of that cry for there can be no art which is not sincere, and if sincerity can be pleaded as an excuse for decadence it can surely be claimed as an ally of truth.

I offer no apology for taking up so much space in commenting on one book since the author does for a century of Catholic literature what these notes are designed to do for the passing moment. I accept Father Alexander's principles; I do not always accept his particular judgments even as I do not expect my readers always to agree with mine. But there is one point in which I am in entire agreement with Father Alexander; he thinks that Mr. Belloc writes too much, and the next book on my list provides a justification for this criticism.

Mr. Belloc's *Milton*² was paid the compliment of being reviewed by all the literary papers immediately on publication. Most of the reviewers devoted a considerable amount of their space to noting Mr. Belloc's inaccuracies; to wit, that England turned Protestant in 1688 and that it was Milton's fault; that Milton "took all the inspired Hebrew folklore literally in every detail of its text"; that Belloc speaks of "the *blank verse* of *Arcades*"; that *Paradise Regained* is a continuation of *Paradise Lost*; that Belloc's criticism of Milton's sonnet form is based on a misreading of Shakespeare's sonnet form. It is a list that strikes one as being more conscientious than formidable. But Mr. Belloc has only himself to blame—if indeed he thinks of blaming anybody—for this meticulous fault-finding. He deals out the same treatment to Milton. It is the privilege of great writers to set the standard by which they themselves shall be judged. It is an honour that not infrequently turns out to be an embarrassment for it can be used unfairly to make a list of the occasions when the master is not at the very topmost limit of his excellence. Every artist has the right to be judged on his best work, for his care is for quality and not quantity, and when the perfect form has been achieved no one should count the

² Cassell. 12s. 6d.

broken shards. Of all the major English poets Milton most deserves to have this fact remembered if we must do him justice. His poetry is a lapidary art and his music is the sonorous organ's note, not the freer human measures that beguile to song and dance. This may be the reason why Mr. Belloc seems to be obsessed with the idea that a poet is a man who writes "lines." It is this curious view of a poet's function, more than Mr. Belloc's anti-Puritanism, that gives to his study such an indeterminate character; he is perpetually see-sawing between admiration of certain "lines" and dislike of the man who wrote them. One closes the book with the impression that a thoroughly objectionable person, timid, mean and inordinately proud, wrote some of the greatest poetry in the English language. This may be the truth, but of how it came about that it was so (which after all is what we want to know) there is no sufficient explanation. The book reads like a lecture, as though Mr. Belloc had dictated it, as witness the recurring phrase, "I say then," with which the speaker, after a digression, rather clumsily gets back into the main stream of his discourse.

William Langland has been called by competent critics—M. Jusserand and Mr. Christopher Dawson among them—the English Dante. That is high praise; whether we agree or no, there is one particular in which Langland stands equal with the Italian, in the depth and reality of his religious experience. With Langland as with Dante the earnestness of his convictions provoked a self-criticism which did not end with himself but passed on to that of which he was a part, the Catholic faith in action. It is this fact which makes the interpretation of both poets such a difficult and delicate matter in an age when sectarian strife misinterprets humility as a confession of error. Mr. Stanley James would have us go *Back to Langland*,³ and view ourselves and modern England in the mirror of his poetry. I doubt if we are ready to do that yet. There are many things we have to learn but we cannot bear them yet. We are not living, as Langland lived, in a Catholic culture, and what was for him but the pruning away of dead and useless wood would seem to us like laying the axe to the roots of a tender sapling struggling for existence.

The title-poem of Fr. F. C. Devas' little book of verse, *Our Ladye of Walsingham*,⁴ recalls the main facts of the almost forgotten story of this English shrine and ends with a prayer that Our Lady will bring back to English hearts the love of her Divine Son. It is straightforward and competent; there is little more that one can say about it, or about the rest of Fr. Devas' verse. One short poem, *Daydream*, 1907, is an almost perfect example of the linking of thought with metre and the idea is sincerely felt. And at the end of the book are two stanzas of fierce irony spoiled by a third which is school-masterish and

³ Burns Oates & Washbourne. 3s. 6d.

⁴ Burns Oates & Washbourne. 1s.

explanatory. The rest of the book is not likely to be remembered; it is prose cut up into the requisite number of feet.

Now Mr. Cathal O'Byrne, though he writes prose, is a poet, or rather he is a story-teller in the tradition of the troubadours. His stories do not require music, they sing themselves. His cadences are voluptuous, full of colour and movement—for many tastes perhaps too opulent. But Mr. O'Byrne can be reticent when he wishes. In his latest volume, *From Far Green Hills*,⁵ his imagination has woven stories round some of the half-glimpsed mysterious figures of the New Testament, Mary of Magdala, the Good Thief, the Woman at the Well. A difficult and dangerous *milieu*? It is, but Mr. O'Byrne has successfully overcome most of the difficulties by the excellence of his technique. His descriptive backgrounds are a riot of colour, his characters drawn with vivid, lyrical force. Only when the Central Figure appears is the music muted, the narrative pruned of every gaudy phrase till it flows with the limpid simplicity of the Sacred Text itself. The result is startlingly beautiful and profoundly reverent.

The most notable thing about *The Akathistos Hymn*,⁶ newly translated by Father Vincent McNabb, is its artistically satisfying appearance. Beautifully printed in black and red on handmade paper it is a production well worthy of St. Dominic's Press. Of course, half-a-guinea for some thirty-five pages should ensure something out of the ordinary, and Messrs. Pepler & Sewell, in their efforts to confound the popular taste for the cheap and nasty, have allowed their devotion full liberty on both counts. But this is not an empty elegance; it fittingly enshrines a lovely Eastern poem in honour of Our Lady.

Lyra Martyrum,⁷ an anthology of the poetry of the English martyrs, compiled by the Rev. Sir John O'Connell, is unexpectedly disappointing. Only six martyrs are represented, surely a small number to justify the use of the word anthology in the sub-title. In planning this book Father O'Connell seems to have hesitated between two ideals and as a consequence it is neither an anthology of religious verse nor a book of poetry, for as to poetry, two of the martyrs, St. Thomas More and B. Robert Southwell, provide nearly all there is both in quantity and quality.

I should like to mention, for the sake of those who have children either to instruct or to entertain, Miss Vera Barclay's charming books introducing Joc and Colette. The one I have before me is called *Joc and Colette on the Seashore*, and is one of Messrs. Burns Oates & Washbourne's nature and science series, price 3s. 6d.

⁵ Brown & Nolan. 3s. 6d.

⁶ Pepler & Sewell. 10s. 6d.

⁷ Burns Oates & Washbourne. 6s.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

ROSARY SUBSTITUTED FOR OFFICE.

What has become of the permission to substitute the Rosary instead of the Office whenever, owing to pressure of work, the Office cannot be said? The diocesan faculties *pagella* used to contain the permission but does so no longer. (Westmonasteriensis.)

REPLY.

Ordinaries have no power to dispense from reciting the Divine Office except in the circumstances of Canon 81, namely, "nisi haec potestas eisdem fuerit explicite vel implicite concessa, aut nisi difficultis sit recursus ad Sanctam Sedem et simul in mora sit periculum gravis damni." A limited power, not of dispensing, but of commuting the obligation to reciting the Rosary is frequently given by the Holy See, and is included in the formula of faculties which the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda issues to Ordinaries in Missionary districts: "n. 42: Concedendi ut ob legitimam gravemque rationem, de qua eius conscientia oneratur, loco divini officii, rosarium vel aliae preces recitari possint."¹ To a question as to what was to be understood by "Rosarium" the Holy Office replied, July 2nd, 1884: "Intelligi integrum rosarium, sed relinqui prudenti arbitrio et conscientiae episcopi, attentis peculiaribus personarum adiunctis, commutationem in tertiam partem et in preces tertiae parti respondentem." Some ordinaries communicated the faculty to their priests in the following sense: the Office was divided into three parts—(1) Matins and Lauds, (2) Little Hours, (3) Vespers and Compline, and a third part of the Rosary, i.e., five decades, represented each third part of the Office for those who were lawfully prevented from reciting that part. It is obviously a source of scrupulosity which, in certain places, is remedied by more precise instructions from the Ordinary. Thus, in America, when the faculty was in use, the Bishops obtained an Apostolic Indult declaring that all priests who heard confessions for five hours could commute Matins and Lauds into the recital of the rosary.²

In England, up to the promulgation of the Code, this power of commutation appears to have been included in the Quinquennial Faculties granted to Ordinaries. But it is no longer found in the ordinary Formula III issued by the *Sacred Consistorial Congregation*. It used to be communicated to the clergy in the diocesan *pagella* of faculties. Thus the West-

¹ Vromant: *Facultates Apostolicae*, 1926, n. 108; Vermeersch: *Periodica*, Vol. XI, 1922, p. 125.

² *American Ecclesiastical Review*, 1909, Vol. XL, p. 499.

minster *pagella* up to the year 1918 contained it, under n. XI: "Recitandi integrum Rosarium, si ob aliquod impedimentum legitimum Divinum Officium recitare non valeas." When the Code appeared a sheet of corrections was issued with this *pagella* directing that n. XI was to be omitted, and in subsequent reprints of the *pagella* no mention was made of this faculty.

But it is, of course, open to any Ordinary to make a request for the faculty. Thus, the faculties issued during the War by the Army Bishop contained under n. 11: "Recitandi tertiam partem Rosarii Marialis, id est decades quinque, si Divinum Officium ob aliquod legitimum impedimentum recitare non valeas."

Accordingly, in the absence of a faculty for commuting the office into a recital of the Rosary, a priest who is excused from the canonical obligation because of physical or moral impossibility, is not bound to say other prayers in place of the office, though it is usual and praiseworthy to do so. "The substitution of three Rosaries or one Rosary for the divine office is not valid apart from privilege. If a priest is exempt from office on a given day, it is usual for him to recite a Rosary in place of the office, though he is not obliged to do so."³ "Qui a recitatione officii legitime est excusatus ob impotentiam physicam aut moralem, non tenetur loco Officii alias preces dicere; quia talis commutatio nullibi praescribitur. Nihilominus laudabiliter recitat alias preces clericus impeditus quominus Officium dicat; ita enim ostendit bonam suam voluntatem satisfaciendi praecepto orandi ab Ecclesia ipsi specialiter imposito."⁴ In the case of a priest who is likely to be prevented habitually, because of moral impossibility, the proper course is for him to petition his Ordinary for a dispensation or commutation.

E. J. M.

OCTOBER DEVOTIONS.

In places where these devotions are not expressly enjoined by the Ordinary, is it now lawful to omit them? Many think that during Mass is not the best time for reciting the Rosary aloud, and, in these days of liturgical revival, the practice is completely at variance with that of following the Mass with the aid of a Missal which, we are given to understand, is the desire of the Church. (M. E.)

REPLY.

The question raises rather a delicate problem and we must tread very carefully indeed. The practice was introduced by Pope Leo XIII in encyclicals of 1883 and 1884, which directed the Rosary and the Litany of Our Lady during October of those years. A decree of the *Congregation of Rites*, August 20th, 1885, ordered the devotion for that year and the following years.

³ Davis: *Moral and Pastoral Theology*, Vol. IV, p. 283.

⁴ Prummer: *Theol. Moralis*, II, §378.

Neither of the encyclicals, *Supremi Apostolatus*, September 1st, 1883, and *Superiori Anno*, August 30th, 1884, is contained in Gasparri's *Fontes*, nor is the decree of August 20th, 1885, in *Decreta Authentica*. But its substance is repeated in a decree of the following year, August 26th, 1886 (n. 3666), confirming the previous decrees in a most ample and unequivocal manner: "... statuit ut quoadusque tristissima perdurent adiuncta, in quibus versatur Catholica Ecclesia, ac de restituta Pontificis Maximi plena libertate Deo referre gratias datum non sit, in omnibus Cathedralibus, etc. . . . Mariale Rosarium cum Litanis Lauretaniis per totum mensem Octobrem quotidie recitetur." The injunction was repeated on September 7th, 1887.¹ A decree of January 16th, 1886,² settled some details, namely, a "pyx" exposition would suffice in places where solemn exposition was not possible; also, where the alternative method was adopted, the prayers were to be said not before or after Mass, but during Mass itself "uno eodemque tempore dicatur quo Missa celebratur." In 1889 the prayer to St. Joseph was added, and Pius X confirmed all that his predecessor had directed in the encyclical *E. Supremi*, October 4th, 1903: "... quoniam has litteras die ipsa damus, quae recolendo Mariali Rosario est instituta, quidquid Decessor Noster de Octobri mense Virgini augustae dicando edixit, publica per templa omnia eiusdem Rosarii recitatione, Nos pariter edicimus et confirmamus; monentes insuper ut deprecatores, etc."³

Quite apart from any liturgical preferences, the reason for doubting whether the practice is still obligatory arises from considering the purpose for which it was introduced, the settlement, namely, of the Roman Question. It has appeared to many that the October devotions are not now of obligation since the Roman Question has been happily settled by the Lateran Treaty.⁴ Others, and these are probably in the majority, think that the obligation remains from Canon 23: "In dubio revocatio legis praeexistentis non praesumitur. . . ." Since it is a matter affecting public worship, it clearly rests with the Ordinary to declare his interpretation of the law. In some dioceses, as in Westminster, the devotion is enjoined in the *Ordo* at the beginning of October. In places where there is no such explicit direction, we are ourselves of the opinion that the practice should be continued, pending direction from the Ordinary.

The liturgically minded may reflect that the recitation of the Rosary has not been decreed as the ordinary method of assisting at Mass, but is an exceptional method ordered during October. Also, it is not ordered during Mass except as an alternative to its recitation during Exposition at some other time of the day.

¹ *Decreta Authentica*, n. 3681.

² *Decreta Authentica*, n. 3650.

³ Gasparri: *Fontes*, III, n. 653, p. 608.

⁴ Cf. references to liturgical periodicals in *Periodica*, 1930, p. 120.

⁵ *Ami du Clergé*, 1931, p. 397.

For those who are capable of following the Mass intelligently with a Missal, this is the normal way of assisting at Mass. If, during October, in some places, they are expected to recite the Rosary instead, they will do so, no doubt, in a proper spirit of humility and obedience. A person reciting the Rosary during Mass, in union with Our Lady at the foot of the cross, may have more real liturgical spirit than the excellent person poring over a missal. An excessive preoccupation with liturgical forms may develop in certain minds a contempt for the common people "who know not the law," and may encourage an attitude which is the reverse of all that the liturgy stands for, foreign to the spirit of Christ and the simplicity of the gospel. Perhaps Holy Mother Church, in her wisdom, is gently correcting this attitude by permitting the Rosary to be said during Mass, in October, when it cannot be said during Exposition.

E. J. M.

THE ROSARY.

Is it true that the Holy See has discountenanced the custom of adding certain words to the first part of the Hail Mary, an addition which is common in some parts in order to recall the mystery to mind? Also, is it permitted to recite "Eternal rest give unto them, etc." in place of the "Gloria Patri" when saying the Rosary during November for the dead? (M. M.)

REPLY.

(1) It is true that the *Sacred Penitentiary*, July 27th, 1920, gave a negative answer to the query whether, in view of Canon 934, §2, the custom of adding words to the Hail Mary could be continued without prejudice to the indulgences attached. The concluding words of Canon 934, §2, state that an indulgence attached to a prayer ceases "ob quamlibet additionem, detractiōnem, vel interpolationem." The custom in question is very widely spread in some parts, especially in Germany and in German-speaking Switzerland; it consists in adding, for example, to Hail Marys in the last Sorrowful Mystery the words: "Der für uns ist gekreuzigt worden"—"Who was crucified for us." Certain German and Swiss Bishops, when this reply became known, informed the Holy See that the custom was of such long standing that it could not be removed without causing scandal and disturbance. The custom, in fact, goes back to the beginning of the fifteenth century and is of Carthusian origin.¹ It was sanctioned by Pius IX in 1859. Receiving these observations of the bishops the *Sacred Penitentiary* issued another declaration, January 22nd, 1921, which, practically speaking, revoked that of the previous year: "Itaque Sacra Penitentiaria re mature perpensa censuit: (1) declarandum esse canonem 934 §2 Codicis Juris Canonici continere legem generalem, quae indultum pianum nullimode revocat; (2) supplicandum SSmo pro extensione

¹ Beringer: *Les Indulgences*, ed. 1905, Vol. I, p. 516.

eiusdem indulti, favore omnium qui juxta praedictum morem in quibuslibet locis SS. Rosarium recitare consueverint. Facta autem de praemissis relatione SSmo Dno. nostro Benedicto. . . . Sanctitas Sua enuntiatam declarationem approbavit, et indulti extensionem, uti supra, benigne concedere dignata est."²

(2) An excellent definition of the Rosary is that of the fourth Lesson for the Feast of the Rosary in the Roman Breviary: "Est autem Rosarium certa precandi formula, qua quindecim angelicarum salutationem decades, oratione Dominica interiecta, distinguimus, et ad earum singulas totidem nostrae reparationis mysteria pia meditatione recolimus." It is beyond all dispute that the addition of "Gloria Patri" to each decade, to say nothing of the other additions at the beginning and at the conclusion of the devotion, does not pertain to the integrity of the exercise and is not required for gaining any indulgences attached.³ It is, nevertheless, an excellent custom and is in conformity with the addition of "Gloria Patri" to the recitation of the Psalms. But, since it is not necessary, we are not forbidden to replace "Gloria Patri" by "Eternal Rest give unto them, etc.", that is to say, the Rosary remains the Rosary with all its indulgences.⁴

What is lawful is not always expedient, particularly in public prayers and devotions which the faithful are accustomed to perform in one particular way. In giving these replies to the queries we are not recommending any changes in the public recitation of the Rosary; on the contrary, *nihil innovetur*.

E. J. M.

THE ALTAR CROSS.

What is the correct character and position of the altar cross? Is it lawful to place it on the top of the Tabernacle? (E.)

REPLY.

Probably the most satisfactory answer to this, and to a variety of other questions arising from liturgical law, is to distinguish between what is absolutely correct, what is tolerated, and what is not tolerated. The ardent liturgist sometimes errs in confounding the first and the second.

(1) "Super altare collocetur Crux in medio."¹ "Supra vero in planitie altaris adsint candelabra sex argentea, si haberi possunt: sin minus ex aurichalco, aut cupro auratro nobilius fabricata, et aliquanto altiora, spectabilioraque his, quae ceteris diebus non festivis apponi solent, et super illis cerei albi, in quorum medio locabitur crux ex eodem metallo, et opere praealta, ita ut pes crucis aequet altitudinem vicinorum

² A.A.S., 1921, XIII, p. 163.

³ Gougard: *Des Indulgentiis*, p. 231.

⁴ Cf. Fanfani: *De Rosario B.M. Virginis*, 1930, p. 3, n. 2.

¹ *Rubricae Generales Missalis*, tit. xx.

candelabrorum, et crux ipsa tota candelabris superemineat cum imagine sanctissimi Crucifixi, versa ad interiorem altaris faciem."² A correct altar cross, therefore, is a crucifix which is of the same character and design as the candlesticks, made of metal, dominating the altar. It is placed on the altar itself in the middle of the candlesticks. The directions are very simple to observe, and the following texts, chiefly from the *Congregation of Sacred Rites*, teach us to what extent a departure from them is permissible.

(2) There appears to be no prohibition against the use of wooden candlesticks, as is customary in Franciscan churches, in which case, one supposes, the crucifix may also be of wood.³ The altar crucifix is not insisted upon if there is a prominent sculpture of the crucifixion behind the altar or on the reredos: "Similiter si in Altari, in quo adest magna statua SS. Crucifixi, sit ponenda alia crux, dum celebratur Missa? Resp. Est sufficiens, et non indiget alia cruce."⁴

De Herdt extends this principle to the case where the Crucifixion is painted on the altar piece: "Et idem dicendum est de cruce depicta in maiori tabula altaris, dummodo Crucifixus primum locum obtineat prae ceteris omnibus quae in eadem tabula exprimuntur."⁵ His authority for this is Benedict XIV in a constitution which is not reprinted in Gasparri's *Fontes*. But one cannot extend this toleration to a representation of the Crucifixion in a stained glass window behind the altar: "Imagines in vitriis fenestrarum depictae nihil cum Altare commune habent."⁶ The chief difficulty, calling for toleration of certain practices, arises where the altar, usually the high altar, has a tabernacle. It can be met by making the table of the altar sufficiently deep to allow for a correct crucifix to stand behind the tabernacle. If this is not possible, one alternative is to use a kind of processional cross, the shaft of which rests in some attachment at the back of the altar. This method is recommended by Geoffrey Webb and fully explained by him in *The Liturgical Altar* (p. 52). The only other alternative is to use the Tabernacle as a base for the crucifix. "An Crux cum imagine Crucifixi, in medio Altaris inter candelabra collocanda, etiam in Altari, ubi Sanctissimum asservatur, collocari possit immediate ante eius tabernaculum; aut super ipsum, vel in postica eius parte? Resp. Crux collocetur inter candelabra, nunquam ante ostiolum tabernaculi. Potest etiam collocari super ipsum tabernaculum, non tamen in throno ubi exponitur Sanctissimum Eucharistiae Sacramentum."⁷ It is not clear on

² *Caeremoniale Episcoporum*, Lib. i., cap. xii., n. 11.

³ Cf. CLERGY REVIEW, Vol. III, p. 504; *Coll. Namurcenses*, 1933, p. 117.

⁴ *Decreta Authentica*, June 16th, 1663, n. 1270, 2.

⁵ *Sacrae Liturgiae Praxis*, Vol. I, §181.

⁶ *Decreta Authentica*, November 10th, 1906, n. 4191, ad 4.

⁷ *Decreta Authentica*, June 11th, 1904, n. 4136.

what authority some interpret this permission as applying exclusively to a fixed crucifix rising from the dome of the Tabernacle. Geoffrey Webb,⁸ quite rightly in our opinion, says that this concession had in mind the flat-topped tabernacle, and the wording of the instruction is sufficiently clear; it is quite lawful to place the crucifix on the tabernacle.

(3) As we have seen, the law supposes a large and prominent crucifix. The very small one which sometimes surmounts the tabernacle itself is insufficient, not because it is on the tabernacle, but because it cannot easily be seen. "An, et quibus remediis removendus sit abusus collocandi parvam Crucem vix visibilem, vel supra Tabernaculum, vel supra aliquam minorem tabulam sitam in medio altaris, loco Crucis collocandae inter Candelabra, ut Rubrica praescribit. Resp. Reprobandum abusus; et ubi invaluit, Ordinarius loci provideat juris et facti remediis. Quod si ob aliquam causam accidentaliter removenda sit Crux sita inter candelabra, alia tempore Sacrificii apte apponatur inferius, sed visibilis tam celebranti quam populo."⁹ It is forbidden, of course, to place the Crucifix in front of the Tabernacle.¹⁰ Lastly, the very common abuse of using the permanent Exposition Throne for the Crucifix cannot be tolerated "Num tolerari potest usus statuendi Crucem super trono, et in eo praecise loco, super quo publicae adorationi in Ostensorio exponitur SSma Eucharistia? Et quatenus affirmative, num tolerari possit usus Crucem ipsam superimponendi Corporali, quod Expositioni inservit? Resp. Negative in omnibus."¹¹

E. J. M.

⁸ *op. cit.*, p. 55.

⁹ *Decreta Authentica*, September 17th, 1822, ad 7; *Cf.* also n. 1270, ad 1.

¹⁰ n. 4136 ad 2, already cited.

¹¹ *Decreta Authentica*, June 2nd, 1883, n. 3576, ad 3; *Cf.* n. 4136, already cited.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Spiritual Letters of Dom John Chapman, O.S.B. Edited with an Introduction by Dom Roger Hudleston. (Sheed & Ward. pp. 330 and xiv. 8s. 6d.)

Abbot Chapman's *Spiritual Letters* must surely be the most important book of its kind that has appeared in English in our day. Of course, there has been much writing about mysticism of late, and some of it has been very good indeed, but the greater part of it has been translation. Abbot Marmion was supreme in his way, but it was a different way. This book consists for the most part of private letters addressed to individuals, and dealing with their difficulties in a particular and concrete way. Although the Abbot's theory of contemplation is always before us and is treated *ex professo* in the Appendices, the bulk of the book is concerned with the actual direction of contemplatives. On the ground of their obvious liability to misinterpretation some people have thought that it was a mistake to publish such letters at all. In answer to criticism, the Editor of the letters, Dom Roger Hudleston, has alleged that they have in fact been misinterpreted by so sympathetic and distinguished a critic as Archbishop Goodier. And still I cannot agree that it was wrong to publish them, for they cannot but do good to the type of soul for which the Abbot was catering. One man's meat is another man's poison, but when the provision is very definitely labelled as being safe for those only who are contemplatives, the others may be expected to leave it alone. After all, even a contemplative must have somebody to minister to him, and there are so few who are able to do it.

The Abbot considers that in the enclosed religious orders of women there is a large proportion of contemplatives, and he has met a much smaller number of monks who are. Outside these limits the number must be relatively small. But, speaking absolutely, there must be a great many in the world, unrecognized by anybody, and, as has been constantly pointed out from the time of St. John of the Cross up to our own day, the progress of such souls is hindered by the unawareness of directors who do not recognize what is happening to them. There are many in the Night of the Senses whose humility would be affronted by any such suggestion. They do not realize that they are just in the hands of God, being moulded as He would have them be, and that their distractions, dryness, "idiocy" (to use a favourite word of Dom Chapman) are all a normal part of the process. And perhaps they make the too common mistake, happily corrected by the author, that contemplation implies a higher degree of sanctity than that which accompanies lower states of prayer. It does seem to be the shortest and most agonizing way to high perfection, but there must be many who have no glimmering notion of the state who are far more meritorious in God's eyes than many of those who have received this

grace. Indeed, many holy people seem to be psychologically incapable of grasping what it is all about. The characteristic passivity of which they read in the books savours of quietism. The deliberate leaving off of meditation seems to be a too easy way of avoiding the difficulty of dryness in meditation. And the acquiescence in a state of prayer which completely despises the presence of distractions, dispenses with systems, and even makes light of "preparation" may appear too like a tempting of God.

But the prayer is not for such as these. No; but how is one to know (as some of the Abbot's correspondents seem to be asking) that I, who find meditation hopelessly difficult, am not one of these? Is there not grave danger of delusion? The test is, *Can you meditate?* If so, you must. Can you say an Our Father through without losing the sense of the words? That is all very well, but is there not danger of an auto-suggestion of such impotence? The Abbot is alive to that possibility, too. But in the last resort he would maintain that if meditation is an impossibility (and if certain other conditions are present) then far from the case being hopeless you have, according to the most authoritative spiritual tradition, an indication that God is leading you, or rather has led you, to a higher state of prayer in which you shall commune with Him in the apex of your soul while in retrospect at least you will be unable to give any account of what has been happening; all you will remember will be the wanderings of your imagination, which, except for their humble acceptance, have nothing whatever to do with the prayer. With this prayer must go a complete abandonment to the will of God, a complete confidence in Him.

Now the whole of Abbot Chapman's direction is concerned with these high and difficult matters. He feels acutely the difficulties which lie in the way of a comprehensive theory of this state, the divergences of the authorities: "St. Teresa and St. John are irreconcilable." He knows them all from Denys through the author of the *Cloud of Unknowing* down to the scientific investigators of our day. St. John is his main authority; St. Francis de Sales is his favourite; Caussade, I think, is his inspiration. But his acute and restless mind could not be satisfied without a coherent theory, and so for years he questions those who have experience of the contemplative state. He is always learning. He has to give direction, and he can do this pretty safely to beginners, but he concludes so many letters with that utterly disarming confession of ignorance: "So I think; and I am not infallible" (p. 163); "Of course, I really know nothing about it all" (p. 77); "I daresay you will say I am simply exaggerating, and that I am all wrong. No doubt I am! But I don't yet see *where* I am wrong" (p. 273).

The letters cover a period of nearly twenty years (the first was written in 1911), and in that time there was bound to be much to correct or modify. But, of course, it is a perfectly fair question whether certain statements should ever have been

made and whether they will do harm as they appear here. Personally, I cannot see that they will. But it is a pity that the orthodoxy of such a distinguished scholar should be liable to posthumous criticism, and yet it is inevitable. In spite of his occasional laughing remarks at the expense of theologians and philosophers, there is ample evidence of his even stern condemnation of any belittling of Catholic teaching, even without the "P.P.S." on page 211 which is worth transcribing: "What comes next is only, I repeat, suggestion. It is incomplete as well as hurried. But note that it was written at least devoutly, and wants reading devoutly, and in a kindly and uncritical spirit. I am not infallible and some of it may be unsound in wording. But I always *try* to be *orthodox*, first of all. For Truth is above Charity, and above everything paramount." (Which last statement is, of course, the best possible justification for unmasking any unorthodoxy which may have unawares crept in.)

I have no doubt whatever that to those who are contemplatives this book will be of the utmost value for their guidance and encouragement. But the vast majority of us, who are not, will find in it an easy and attractive explanation of what contemplation means and of its importance, and priests may be led to enquire further into a subject the knowledge of which may become necessary when and where it is least expected, for their own souls or for their penitents. That necessity received notice from Abbot Butler in the early pages of this Review,¹ and it was again emphasized by the anonymous author of a distinguished series of articles on that stage of the spiritual life which is the birth of contemplative prayer as seen chiefly from the outside by the confessor.² In speaking of St. John of the Cross this second writer has a remark which seems very appropriate here: "It is well to remember," he writes, "that here as elsewhere in theology, it is only on paper or to the spectator from without that the path of orthodoxy seems to cross a tight-rope. In practice, the Christian and the contemplative, guided by the Church and the Holy Spirit, pass by the danger without being aware of its existence. In the particular case of contemplative prayer the necessary distinctions, simple in practice, are not so easy to make verbally, and no careless and easy phrases will do for our use, but we can gain some suggestion of the truth by saying that in this early stage of contemplation the soul's part consists in actively receiving—receiving, that is, as a free agent receives."

One thing is certain: few readers will peruse these letters without receiving something more, and more valuable, than mere information; many souls will be invigorated by a breath of that keen air in which the revered Abbot seems constantly to have lived.

T. E. F.

¹ "Prayer," THE CLERGY REVIEW, March, 1931.

² "Contemplative Prayer," THE CLERGY REVIEW, March, April, May, 1932.

L'Angleterre Catholique a la Veille du Schisme. By Pierre Janelle. (Gabriel Beauchesne et ses Fils. Royal 8vo. pp. 380. 60 francs.)

When he published three of Bishop Stephen Gardiner's political tracts, under the title *Obedience in Church and State*, in 1930, M. Pierre Janelle promised us a more complete study of the courtier-prelate's religious and political ideas. He has now given us the first volume of that study and there can be no doubt that it is a work of the greatest importance for all students of the beginnings of the Reformation in this country. Histories of the Reformation there are in abundance, but almost all deal with known facts and the sequence of external events. Nobody hitherto has attempted an adequate discussion of the psychological problem: the reaction of men's minds to the new ideas, to the royal demand for an undivided loyalty, to the suppression of Papal power in England, and to the first movement of rising heresy. Was the anti-papal spirit really strong in England? Was piety on the decline? Did men realize whither the Royal Supremacy might lead them? Is there an explanation for the tragic apathy which, with a few noble exceptions, seems to have settled on both clergy and laity while Henry worked his will? In the seven long chapters of this well-written book M. Janelle supplies answers to these and similar questions, using Stephen Gardiner as a typical figure of his age. He shows that the England of Gardiner's youth was sincerely religious, but that its religion was rather an affair of the heart and imagination than of the head. It suffered from "une imagination mystique détachée des contingences matérielles." The remnants of Lollardy counted for little, the old hostility against the Avignon Papacy had given way to respect tempered with suspicion, while vestiges of the conciliar movement still lingered, and the doctrine of Papal Supremacy was far from clear. A new danger existed too in the growing humanism which tended to despise the devotional practices of the simple, and, in the spiritual life, led to a "dangerous lethargy" which was creeping over the higher clergy. Add to this a strong sense of reverence for the Monarchy, with the result that when Henry launched his divorce campaign the clergy did his bidding, and either could not or would not see the danger of the situation. "Ce sont de bons esprits et souvent de bons cœurs: ce ne sont pas des combattants."

In this volume M. Janelle tells us Gardiner's story as far as 1535, and a sorry story it is. We see nothing yet of the stout defender of orthodoxy who was to suffer imprisonment under Edward. Here is the King's envoy to the Roman court, the harsh and skilful bully of Pope Clement VII, anxious above all to please his Royal master. When Henry began to attack ecclesiastical jurisdiction, Gardiner hesitated. Around him began to gather the elements of an opposition. "We await a decisive gesture which will carry away the crowd and hold

the King at bay. There is a moment of suspense; and then silence. The opposition fails. It makes all the concessions the King demands; and Gardiner withdraws from the scene. He has missed a unique chance to stem the current of events." Thenceforth his fall was rapid, and we leave him in 1535 defending the Royal Supremacy with specious argument, and vilifying at Henry's command the memory of the saintly Fisher. He had sunk very low.

Several other conclusions are worthy of notice. It was the lack of a definite theory on the Papacy which was perhaps the Church's greatest weakness. "Aux exigences du roi ne s'opposait aucun corps de doctrine bien arrêté; la résistance de ses adversaires était minée par le vague de leurs opinions; ils étaient mal préparés pour fixer le moment où ils diraient: 'Jusqu'ici et pas plus loin.'" Secondly, Henry wielded a most powerful weapon in the new printing presses which he used with skill to manufacture opinion "as in a laboratory." Thirdly, the English Church was so poor in anti-papal writings that the royal pamphleteers had to look abroad for their arguments—a strong argument against Anglican "continuity." Is it, after all, to Marsilius of Padua that we owe the title "Bishop of Rome"?

M. Janelle's work is heavily documented and seems singularly free from minor slips. He is mistaken in using the title *King's Book* for the memorandum presented to Clement VII at Orvieto in 1528 (p. 89). The choice of John Hale as an example of weakness (p. 199) is unfortunate, as he was among the first martyrs. The reference for Appendix II should be Cleopatra E. VI, and on p. 193, no. 2, Vol. VII is meant. The note on p. 218 is incorrect, for the letter in question is printed in full by Muller on p. 60 of his collection. There are a few misprints but these are nothing in comparison with the value of this scholarly and suggestive book. It is to be hoped that we shall soon see the second volume.

ANDREW BECK, A.A.

Ven. Dominic Barberi in England. By Fr. Urban Young, C.P. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. 6s. pp. xx. and 230.)

This book consists mainly of a series of letters by Fr. Dominic discovered after the official *Life* had been written. Fr. Urban Young, the writer of the *Life*, has translated and edited these letters. He allows the voice of Fr. Dominic to come to us undisturbed by any but the briefest and most necessary commentary. A preface to the Letters is provided by Fr. Dominic's own account of the history of his vocation. As everybody knows, the saintly Passionist had from his earliest years a divine inspiration to work for the conversion of England, and not the least edifying lesson of the book is the patience and confidence with which he waited during the long years for the opening of his mission.

The first approach came when he was sent to found a house of the Order in Belgium. His letters from that foundation show him serving a sort of noviceship for the still harder work that was to come presently. He and his brethren had to learn French and to win their way against considerable coldness and even hostility.

But in Belgium he was close to the coveting hand of Wiseman, and before many years had passed he was visiting England to examine the possibilities of a foundation here. Once established, his long pent-up zeal for the conversion of the country burst all bounds of merely self-regarding prudence. He quickly learned enough English to preach and hear confessions; he gave retreats and missions up and down the country; he established several houses; he corresponded with Protestants, wrote theological tracts, examined ecclesiastical students, while all the time exercising his office of superior to both foundations.

Of course, the red-letter day of his mission was October 9th, 1845, when at Littlemore he received Newman, Stanton and Bowles into the Church. His own account of that event, which has made his name familiar to English Catholics everywhere, is given in an hitherto unpublished letter in this book.

The *Letters* provide a history of the establishment of the Passionists in England, but they also throw interesting sidelights on the state of religion in the country a century ago. Fr. Dominic seems to have been thrown into contact more with the converts than with the "born" Catholics, and to have had a more ready sympathy with them. But it is to be remarked that the man who was so eager to send more and more Italian Passionists into the country which he saw white for the harvest was ready to throw every man he had into the front line when the plague which followed the Irish famine devastated the cities in which the poor Catholic Irish immigrants had taken refuge.

Fr. Urban Young has done a good work by rendering these letters into very convincing English. Mr. Denis Gwynn contributes an illuminating introduction.

T. E. F.

THE CHURCH AT HOME AND ABROAD

I. FRANCE.

BY DENIS GWYNN, D.Litt.

For weeks past the Abyssinian crisis has eclipsed all other questions, and it is impossible to discuss here a situation which seems very likely to have developed irrevocably before the end of September. But it may be well to emphasize several factors which must profoundly affect the future. The dilemma of having to forfeit the friendship of either England or Italy would have been an appalling prospect for any French Prime Minister, and M. Laval is by no means a superman. The Government which he leads is nominally a National Government in the same sense as Mr. Baldwin's Government in England, but it has never commanded anything like the same degree of confidence. When M. Doumergue was recalled from his retirement to restore order in France after the riots in February last year, he did represent the hopes of almost all Frenchmen, and he symbolized the desire of the ordinary man to escape from party politics. His personal popularity and his prestige as a former President of the Republic gave him an authority which the professional politicians had all lost through years of dissension and vacillation. But when Doumergue's Ministry fell, M. Flandin could claim no similar qualifications as his successor. His chief hope lay in the fact that he was a comparatively new figure in public life, that he belonged to a younger generation, and that he was reputed to be specially expert in economics and finance. His Ministry began under many disadvantages and soon exhausted its prestige. When Flandin fell, there was no alternative but to resume the familiar process of manipulating party combinations, and after a series of abortive attempts to form a coalition, M. Laval was chosen as the most likely to succeed.

Having become Prime Minister under such conditions, M. Laval could not possibly have expected a long tenure of office. Only a leader of heroic stature could have kept France united under his personal guidance during the crises of the past month. M. Laval has certainly not shown such heroic qualities, though he has done his best in an extremely trying and thankless task. Divisions in his Cabinet had become so acute that when the French delegation to Geneva was selected he had to bring with him two former Premiers, M. Herriot and M. Paul Boncour, as well as the Presidents of the Foreign Affairs' Committees of the Chamber and the Senate. Both Herriot and Boncour were known to distrust Laval's personal inclination towards friendship with Italy at all costs and both have kept him jealously under observation from day to day. Another significant feature of the

French delegation was that all its leading figures represented the parties of the Left, while the Right wing of the Coalition Ministry was not represented by anyone of first-rate importance. Laval himself began his political career as a Socialist, but left that Party and has since developed on independent and opportunist lines. By temperament and by his antecedents he belongs to the Left, but his foreign policy has committed him so deeply to alliance with Mussolini that he has been out of sympathy with that strong current of French opinion which has been running against Fascism, and to some extent in favour of internationalism as it is implied by the League of Nations.

Developments at Geneva and in Rome have consequently made M. Laval's position increasingly insecure and have strengthened the prestige and influence of M. Herriot. But if Laval falls France will be faced with an acute political crisis in which it will be more difficult than ever to form a Ministry of National Union. Public opinion has become deeply divided between those who think that Italian friendship must be sacrificed and those who believe that the "Stresa front" must be upheld at all costs as a guarantee against future aggression by Germany. Agreement between these two sections, especially if Mussolini commences war in Abyssinia, will be almost inconceivable; and a return to party politics seems inevitable. But if that should happen, other factors will complicate matters further. M. Herriot, for instance, leads those who believe that Briand's policy of basing France's future defence upon the League of Nations must be steadfastly pursued. If that policy involves conflict with Italy they will pursue it with deep regret and with unceasing efforts towards reconciliation with Italy. But this is not the attitude of a large section of opinion on the Left. The Socialists and Communists see in the present crisis an opportunity for international action to destroy the Fascist régime. To accomplish that purpose, M. Léon Blum and his Socialist followers (who have virtually held the balance of power in the Chamber for years past) might very possibly guarantee support to a new Ministry. There has been a strong trend towards the Left in France since the riots of February, 1934, and its organizers have concentrated deliberately on denouncing Fascism in all its forms. A few months ago the rival demonstrations of the Right and of the Left on the Fête Nationale showed that the Left had made immense progress with its organization and can now muster a much larger following than the semi-Fascist bodies of the Right. One of the chief features of these demonstrations was the emergence of the ex-Premier, M. Daladier, as a Communist leader in Paris, greeting the enormous procession with the Communist salute as it went by for hours. The present alliance between Socialists and Communists has greatly strengthened the weight of anti-Fascist influence in French politics, and that full weight will certainly be thrown against Mussolini in foreign politics. M. Laval's efforts to placate Mussolini will have strengthened the determination of the Left

to bring him down. His economy decrees have been extremely unpopular and are certain to provoke an internal crisis in France before long.

M. Laval's chances of survival are therefore very precarious. M. Herriot is by far the most distinguished figure among the former Prime Ministers, and his long connection with Lyons gives him a solid backing, such as the ordinary politician lacks, and comparable to that which the Chamberlain family have established in Birmingham. But the Radical groups who can be counted upon to support M. Herriot have shown a miserable reluctance to assume responsibility during recent crises. They dread the danger of losing support to the Socialists, and unless they are assured of definite promises of co-operation they can scarcely be expected to take a strong line. M. Léon Blum and the Socialists will make the most of their opportunities, and the result may well be a decided movement towards the Left in the formation of any government which replaces M. Laval. For the Church in France any such development must naturally produce new anxieties, and it is more than ever desirable that the Church should not be identified with the reactionary politics of such movements as the Croix de Feu. Its forces are, in fact, being organized in other directions within the wide framework of Catholic Action, and on a strictly non-political basis. One of the most notable events of the month was the success of the first national congress, at Tours, of the Jeunesse Agricole Catholique, which aims at strengthening and organizing the Catholic forces outside the towns.

II. CENTRAL EUROPE.

BY C. F. MELVILLE.

1. *Germany.*

The recent declaration by the Catholic German bishops was heard by congregations in Catholic churches throughout Germany, but its publication was forbidden by the Government.

The declaration was restrained in tone, but re-affirmed the determination of Catholics to place God above the State, and to resist the pagan influences.

In spite of the growing power of the pagan elements of the Nazi Radical wing, and the renewed vigour of the drive against Christianity, Catholic resistance remains firm.

No Catholic in the Third Reich is deceived by the official declarations made by the Nazi leaders at the party conference at Neuremberg that the régime is not against religion but merely against political clericalism. For political clericalism no longer exists in Germany. The Catholic Church is not pursuing any political aims: it is resisting paganism, and it is defending the rights granted it under the Concordat, in regard to which the State, and not the Church, has shown bad faith.

The latest example of the non-fulfilment by the Government of the agreements into which it entered in the Concordat is the suspension of the Catholic Workers' Association in Münster, on the pretext that it has been indulging in "activities hostile to the State." A statement has been issued by the police to the effect that a local secretary of the Association was found to possess documents which showed evidence of attempts to sabotage the work of the official Nazi Arbeitsfront. The police statement also alleges that high officials of the Association maintain an attitude hostile to the State.

The allegations are couched in the usual vague terms, which are invariably employed when an excuse is needed to close down a Catholic organization the existence of which has been guaranteed by the Concordat. These excuses are just trumped up by the authorities in order to camouflage the truth, which is that the Nazis are determined to eliminate all organizations—social, educational, vocational, or otherwise—which are not part of the Nazi party structure.

But, as I have said, this new *Kulturkampf* is being resisted by the Catholics. In Bavaria and the Rhineland, for instance, the Catholic population has been described by an impartial observer as being "in a state of effervescence." In many villages members of the Hitler Youth can no longer show themselves in their uniforms for fear of being mobbed by the inhabitants. In the earlier days of the Nazi régime Brown Shirt processions were cheered in these parts. To-day, even in large centres like Coblenz and Münster, the streets become empty as soon as a Nazi procession appears on the scene.

One of the most remarkable examples of Christian resistance—I employ the more general term "Christian" in this case, because on the occasion in question Catholics and Evangelicals co-operated—took place in Münster recently in connection with the visit to that town of Professor Hauer and his neo-pagan German Faith Movement. As the Professor left the railway station he was met by a large crowd of Catholics and Protestants who sang hymns without intermission, the Catholic hymns alternating with the Protestant ones. The crowds kept order, and neither police nor Nazi Black Guards could interfere. The same thing happened in the hall where Professor Hauer gave his lecture. There was no violence, but the Professor was unable to make himself heard and his meeting was a fiasco.

Furthermore, since the intensification of the persecution of the Church, congregations have increased. The churches are often unable to hold the vast crowds, so that the doorways and even the churchyards are often thronged during Mass.

Those preachers, particularly, who are able to combine eloquence with an uncompromising attitude, invariably attract enormous congregations. Prominent amongst these priests is the former Crown Prince Georg of Saxony. His sermons in the Hofkirche—which are generally based on such texts as "Thou

shalt have no other gods before me," and "Thou shalt not kill"—are immensely popular.

At the same time, in spite of these good omens, it cannot be denied that the neo-pagan movement is making considerable headway amongst German youth. The German Christian Movement, which sought to reconcile a quasi-paganism with Evangelical Protestantism, has in the main been a failure. It offered only an unworkable compromise and therefore failed to attract a wide circle of adherents. Indeed, there is a story told of the frantic efforts of a German Christian pastor to gather together a congregation of respectable proportions in order to make a good appearance in front of a party of English visitors. Likewise the Odin- and Thor-worship of General Ludendorf and his little group does not appear to make much popular appeal, largely because the General is generally regarded as not being quite right in the head. But the German Faith Movement—which avoids both the compromise of the German Christians, and the more exaggerated absurdities of the Ludendorf group—seems to have had a number of successes.

Professor Hauer, the leader, has said that his followers need not make themselves ridiculous by worshipping Odin and Thor, but that the Divine Principle can be found in the fact of the German race. It has, however, a pagan symbolism and a pagan ritual, including the "sunwheel." Nazi Youth, who are members of this cult, sing anti-Christian songs.

Here is an example:—

Die Zeit verging, doch der Pfaffe blieb,
Dem Volke die Seele zu rauben,
Und ob ers romisch, lutherisch trieb,
Er lehrte judischen Glauben.

Die Zeit des Kreuzes ist nun vorbei,
Das Sonnenrad will sich erheben,
So werden mit Gott wir endlich frei,
Dem Volke die Ehre zu geben.

("The time passed by, but the priest remained to steal the people's soul away. And whether he acted in the Roman or the Lutheran manner he taught the Jewish faith.

"The time of the Cross has gone now; the Sunwheel shall arise. And so with God, we shall be free at last and give our people their honour back.")

2. Austria.

The Viennese Press, including the clerical *Reichpost*, is expressing great anxiety in regard to the Italo-Abyssinian dispute, fearing that if the League takes sanctions against Italy Signor Mussolini will come to terms with Herr Hitler at the expense of a compromise in regard to Austria.

These expressions of opinion, officially inspired, denote a

growing nervousness both in official circles and amongst Catholics generally in Austria. An Italo-German *rapprochement*, it is thought, might result in a coalition government, including a few Nazis, being thrust upon Austria. This would be the thin end of the wedge, and the full Nazification of Austria would rapidly follow.

The resistance to Nazism in the political field in Austria is well known. I propose here to deal with it from the specifically Catholic angle. For it is not only that the Nazification of Austria would create a highly dangerous political situation in Central Europe. It is that it would also mean the penetration of Nazi neo-paganism into that country.

Under the present Austrian régime, the penetration of Austrian youth by these pagan ideas is not extensive. It can only work through the underground and proscribed Nazi organizations. By these methods it has made a small inroad into the schools, in spite of the vigilance of the teachers. But it may safely be said that it is not on a large scale. With the subjection of Austria to a Nazi régime, taking its orders from Germany, however, the situation would become very different; a wave of neo-paganism from the Reich would sweep over the Austrian youth organizations and submerge the schools. There would, of course, be resistance from the Catholics—but it would mean, in any case, a replica of the situation in Germany. More than that it would mean the disappearance of the last citadel of Catholic government in the Germanic world.

A large proportion of Catholics in Austria, of course, look to a Hapsburg restoration as a barrier against absorption by National-Socialist Germany. In this connection, considerable interest attaches to an article on the attitude of Catholics towards monarchism in Austria, which appeared recently in the Catholic organ, *Christliche Standestaat*, by Professor Nikolaus Dohm.

The author's thesis is that while the Church should be freed from politics, the Church should permeate politics, this being the ideal of Catholic Action. The Church is indifferent to the actual structure of the State or form of government. Even the Papal Encyclical, *Quadragesimo Anno*, upon which the present Austrian State system is based, does not stipulate any particular political system, as it concerns itself with social questions which could be dealt with in a Catholic spirit within any form of State.

The fundamental way in which Catholic teaching bears upon this question is in regard to the Catholic principle that authority is only valid inasmuch as it derives from God.

The faithful, the argument continues, will therefore prefer such forms of government as best express the fundamental principle of authority deriving from God. And monarchy, it is suggested, is a formal and historical expression of this principle.

The author instances the cases of the late Dr. Dollfuss in Austria and of Senor Giles Robles in Spain. Both these men, he says, were exponents of the Catholic cause, with predominantly Catholic aims. But it is also a fact that royalists formed the majority of their Catholic supporters. But he issues the warning that a monarchist restoration must not mean Reaction, and that Catholicism must not be used as a tool of political policy. Catholicism must be "depolitized."

The same issue of the *Christliche Standestaats* also contains some interesting matter regarding the Jewish question. The paper says that the supporters of an independent Catholic Austria are concerned to lessen and not to augment racial hatred (for anti-Semitism and racial persecution have been expressly condemned by the Catholic Church in Austria). At the same time it issues a note of warning against those Jewish political elements in Austria which, in the words of the paper, bring discredit on the Austrian fight against German National-Socialism by adopting the sort of weapons used by the latter. These people must not assume, the article continues, that Austria's fight to preserve a European culture is purely and simply a matter of fighting for Jewish interests.

In this connection it is necessary to say a word on the question of anti-Semitism in Austria as compared with anti-Semitism in Nazi Germany. There is no denying that strong currents of anti-Semitism exist in Austria to-day, as they always have done, quite apart from the Nazis. But anti-Semitism as a racial theory or as a State system does not exist in Catholic Austria, and cannot do so because the Church expressly condemns it.

With regard to purely Catholic interests, Catholic circles in Austria express considerable satisfaction at the great progress which has been made in the schools. Religious instruction has now been extended to the technical colleges for the first two years. In this connection the *Reichpost* recalls the words of Dr. Dollfuss in September, 1933. The late Chancellor then declared that the greatest crime which can be done to youth is to bring up a young man as a materialist and an egoist without recognition of the Higher Power. These words have been borne in mind, and now the younger generation is being brought up in the schools and in the home in the full Christian spirit.

Satisfaction was also expressed recently by President Miklas in regard to the particular devotion of Austrians to Our Lady.

Speaking on the occasion of a recent Catholic rally at the famous place of pilgrimage, Frauenkirchen, in the Burgenland, in celebration of its sixth hundredth anniversary, the President said for centuries Catholic Austria had been a land with a special veneration for Our Lady. This devotion was one of the oldest and best Austrian traditions, which had brought great blessings in the past and was to-day a source of comfort and strength. He also spoke enthusiastically of the Catholic family

as the source of culture and morality. The renewal of the family, he said, was the corner-stone of Austria's future.

The State could do a certain amount to promote and protect the family, by giving it a legal and economic existence. But the true renewal of the family must come from within. This was a matter of faith in God—the inculcation of which was the task of the Church—the family policy of the Christian State.

3. *Czechoslovakia.*

Mgr. Jan Sramek, Czechoslovak Minister for the Unification of Laws, who recently celebrated his sixty-fifth birthday, has long taken an active and influential part not only in the Church life of his country but also in social welfare and politics.

Over thirty years ago he was one of the framers of the Christian Socialist programme which later became the basis of the platform of the People's (Catholic) Party. In 1905 he was appointed Lecturer in Sociology at the Faculty of Theology, Brno, and in 1911 Professor. In 1906 he was returned to the Bohemian Diet, and in 1907 elected Deputy to the Vienna Parliament. On the establishment of the Czechoslovak State after the War he became Chairman of the Czechoslovak People's (Catholic) Party, and has been a Deputy of the Prague Parliament since 1920. He has been a member successively of nine Cabinets, and has held the portfolios of Health, Railways, Posts and Telegraphs, Social Welfare and Unification. On several occasions he has also acted as Deputy-Premier. His many activities also include journalism, and for eight years, from 1911 to 1919, he edited the weekly *Nas Vek* (Our Age). In 1912 he was appointed Papal Chamberlain, and in 1924 Apostolic Protomotary. In the latter year the Faculty of Theology of Olomouc conferred on him the degree of D.D. (*honoris causa*).

4. *Yugoslavia.*

An interesting development has taken place in Yugoslavia where the one-time Serbian Radical, Slovene Clerical and Bosnian Moslem parties have united in the Yugoslav Radical Union Party. The President of the new party is the Prime Minister, Dr. Stoyadinovitch (Serbian Radical), and the Vice-Presidents are Father Korochetz (Slovene Clerical) and Dr. Spaho (Bosnian Moslems).

The Slovene Clericals and the Bosnian Moslems were, until recently, in opposition. They now belong to the Government Party, and both Father Korochetz and Dr. Spaho are members of the Cabinet, the former as Minister of the Interior and the latter as Minister of Communications.

Father Korochetz, the well-known Slovene Catholic leader, was born in Styria (Austria) on May 12th, 1872. He made his primary and secondary studies at Ptout and then entered the seminary at Maribor, finishing his theological studies at Gratz, where he took his doctorate in 1905. He was at one time director

of *The Slovene Economist* and of *Sudsteierische Presse*, where he defended the Slovene cause. In 1906 he created the Slovene federation in Styria. He entered the Austrian Parliament, of which he remained a member until the fall of the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

Previously President of the Slovene Club in the Austrian Parliament, he became in 1917 the leader of the Yugoslav party. In 1918 he was President of a national assembly held at Ljubliana and later at Zagreb. Entering into contact with the Serbian Government he concluded with that Government and the Yugoslav Committee the Pact of Geneva, which marked a big step towards the foundation of a united Yugoslavia. Since the foundation of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia Dr. Korochetz had held Cabinet posts in various Yugoslav Governments, and in 1928 he was Prime Minister.

* * * *

The Archbishop of Ljubliana has left for France, where he will embark for North America in order to assist at the Eucharistic Congress at Cleveland, then at the inauguration of a monument to the illustrious Slovene missionary, Mgr. Baraga, which will be erected in the Yugoslav park at Cleveland under the presidency of Cardinal Hayes, Archbishop of New York. Mgr. Rozman will take this opportunity of spending a month in the Yugoslav colonies of North America.

REVIEWS FROM ABROAD

We are pleased to draw attention to the Review *GRANDS LACS* which appears to be everything that a missionary periodical should be. It is concerned with Belgian Missions and differs from the ordinary missionary bulletin in that the material offered to the reader is not just a series of anecdotes, and still less just one long appeal for funds. Instead, the intellectual interest predominates and, although it deals primarily with the Belgian Congo, it serves the missionary interests of the whole of Africa. Its very large circulation, over 10,000 at the moment, enables the White Fathers to produce an excellent illustrated monthly at the very small cost of twenty francs per annum. The September number contains an article by Fr. N. Antoine on the formation of a native clergy in the Seminary of Baudouinville, and another by Mgr. V. Roelens, Vicar Apostolic in the Congo, on the spiritual future of the black races.

In *THEOLOGISCH-PRAKTIISCHE QUARTALSCHRIFT*, 1935, heft 3, Fr. Karl Sudbrack, S.J., discusses the problems connected with the care of the sick, and Dr. J. Arand has a useful little note on the conditional baptism of Protestants converted to the Church. He recalls the diplomatic reply of Fr. Forster, S.J., of Palace Street, when questioned about the alleged baptism of King Edward VII on his death-bed: "I wish I could say it was true."

The Maltese Review *SCIENTIA*, July-September, 1935, contains two English contributions. Mr. D. J. Arkell writes on the bearing of modern mathematical work on the structure of matter, and Fr. Vincent McNabb, O.P., gives some useful elucidations of St. Thomas's Proofs of the Existence of God. He draws a comparison between the classic second question of the First Part of the *Summa Theologica*, and q.q. 44 and 61 of the same part, in order to bring out the significance of the order in which God's causality is treated, namely: (1) efficient, (2) exemplar, and (3) final. No objection is raised in the text against God as the Exemplar Cause, probably because no specious argument could be brought on this title.

In *BULLETIN DE LITTÉRATURE ECCLESIASTIQUE* (University of Toulouse), Dr. Cavallera studies the discussion of the Fathers of the Council of Trent which led up to Canon 4: "Si quis dixerit parvulis antequam ad annos discretionis pervenerint necessariam esse Eucharistiae communionem A.S." The discussions on the disciplinary canon were closely connected with the doctrinal interpretation of St. John c. vi., since, largely owing to the influence of Cajetan, a purely spiritual meaning was given by many to the words *nisi manducaveritis*. . . . The same number contains the text of a letter from Lammenais to Ventura, one of the men in whom he confided most concerning his efforts to renew the spirituality of his time.

A metaphysical study by Dr. Pelster in GREGORIANUM, 1935, fasc. 3, enumerates the translations of Aristotle which St. Thomas appears to have used. The translation from the Arabic version, the work not of Gerardus of Cremona but of Michael Scottus, was used by him from the beginning of his literary activities. Fr. T. Lynch edits, for the first time, the *Newman-Perrone Paper on Development*. The summary of his views was sent by Newman to Perrone in 1847, and the Roman theologian made comments upon it in parallel columns. "This is the Paper put into Fr. Perrone's hands by me in 1847, when I was eager to know how far my view of Doctrinal development was admissible." The original MS., in the possession of the Fathers of the Birmingham Oratory, is edited with some explanatory notes and is a most interesting addition to our knowledge of Newman's thought.

The leading article in JUS PONTIFICIUM is a study by Dr. Toso of St. Thomas More's position and authority as a lawyer, not the least among the many notices which have been occasioned by his canonization. Dr. Piontek, in explaining the canonical method of removing parish priests, gives special attention to those who are styled "movable." An Ordinary acts invalidly and transgresses the law if he regards this class of parish priest as being removable "ad nutum." That is by no means the case; they are called "movable" because the law permits a briefer and an easier method of transferring them when the good of souls require it. Dr. Creusen comments on Canon 114—*De Eccardinatione et Incardinatione Implicita*, and Dr. Oesterle continues his explanation of the guarantees required in Mixed Marriages. This number of JUS PONTIFICIUM, containing a happy blend of theory and practice, is one of the most useful we have had for some time.

There are some interesting glimpses of Savonarola and Alexander VI in Michael de la Bedoyere's contribution in the September THOUGHT, "a chapter in the fight between the good and the right." Mr. J. Kohlbrenner explains the origin and formative years of *Catholic Girls' Secondary Schools in America*. The system has served as the model for educational reorganization in some European and Asiatic countries, and this article throws much light on the historical antecedents of the Catholic high school for girls. In America, as in many other places, it is the "secondary" school which has had the most chequered history of all the units of education. Fr. Moran, S.J., describes, in an attractive and popular way, the *Eucharistic Sacrifice in Ancient Corinth*.

Amongst the more specifically clerical reviews we may mention an article by Fr. Tromp, S.J., in PERIODICA DE RE CANONICA ET MORALI, 1935, fasc. 3, calling our attention to the pastoral instructions given at various times by St. Robert Bellarmine in the course of his work in the diocese of Capua, to which See he was appointed in 1602. In the short space of three years, he visited the whole diocese, held three diocesan Synods, and

convoked a Provincial Synod. Elected fittingly on Good Shepherd Sunday, the Archbishop, in the four discourses summarized here, expounded the idea of "bonus pastor in populo." His laws were made for the future guidance of the chief pastor of the See and he observed them all himself exactly. In the same number, Fr. Vermeersch contests the view of a Redemptorist writer who holds that, from Canon 523, the confession of a sick religious may be heard by a priest who is approved for confessions, though not in the diocese where the confession of the sick religious is being heard.

IN COLLATIONES BRUGENSES, July-August, 1935, Dr. Brys examines the law forbidding certain amusements and recreations to clerics. The positive law is found to determine more precisely what is already a natural obligation, namely, to avoid those things which prevent the proper exercise of the clerical office, which lessen the reverence due to the clerical state, and which give occasion of scandal to the laity.

Two useful contributions in LA VIE SPIRITUELLE for September regard the priestly life from quite a different aspect. Fr. Masure stresses the perfection necessary in the priest from the fact that he says Mass, and Fr. Brillet deals with the same point from the nature of the priestly ministry in the service of souls. It is, in fact, this two-fold relation to the real and to the mystical Body of Christ which is the basis of all the traditional doctrine concerning the sanctity of the priestly office.

E. J. M.

ENGLISH REVIEWS.

IN THE HOMILETIC AND PASTORAL REVIEW for September Mgr. Henry continues his survey of preaching in an interesting article entitled *Conversational Preaching* which is full of sound advice. Fr. Woywood has a valuable article on Suspension "ex informata conscientia."

THE BUCKFAST ABBEY CHRONICLE leads off with an article on *The Monastic Ideal*, which is a paper read by Abbot Vonier at the recent Truro Catholic Congress. An interesting article with excellent illustrations is devoted to the ornaments of the chasuble.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW contains an answer by Mgr. Murphy to an article in the July number by Dr. Dargin which contended that such political activities as those associated with the name of Fr. Coughlin are direct violations of existing canon law. Fr. Dargin publishes a rejoinder. The whole discussion is a model of the sobriety with which such controversy should be conducted.

BLACKFRIARS for September contains a notable article by Mr. Bernard Kelly, *Passage Through Beauty*. In the same sphere of thought is the paper on *The Value of the Creative Faculty in Man* by Mr. Eric Gill.

CORRESPONDENCE

ROMAN DECREES.

Dr. Messenger writes :—

(1) By heading my article "Another Point of View," I expressly allowed that there may be other opinions on this subject. My own aim was merely to show that there is very respectable theological authority for the view I myself set forth.

(2) "Non-infallible teaching" is, of course, not confined to Roman decrees. But the main subject of my article was the assent due to these particular non-infallible decisions. This should explain my terminology. Of course, non-infallible teaching is found in Encyclicals, etc. But these also are issued "from time to time."

(3) Dr. Cartmell objects that this phrase, "from time to time," overlooks "the great mass of Catholic teaching which is continuous, and not occasional," such as the "*doctrinae capita, quae communi et constanti Catholicorum consensu retinentur ut theologicae veritates ita certae ut opiniones eisdem doctrinae capitibus adversae, quamquam haereticæ dici nequeant, tamen aliam theologicam mereantur censuram.*" But this raises an entirely different question, i.e., the authority of theologians. I have expressed my opinion on this matter in my *Evolution and Theology*, pp. 241-2, and do not think it necessary to repeat it in the CLERGY REVIEW. But I may as well say that I can hardly agree with Dr. Cartmell's apparent identification of theologians with the *magisterium ecclesiae*.

(4) Dr. Cartmell very fairly criticizes my phrase, "merely human knowledge," as the subject matter of Roman decrees. But this phrase must be taken in conjunction with "divine knowledge given in Revelation," from which this other knowledge is distinguished in the sentence in my article. I myself speak on p. 94 of one Roman decree as "closely connected with dogmatic truth."

(5) It is, of course, perfectly true that, as Wilmers says and Dr. Cartmell repeats, many Roman decisions are absolutely certain, "on other grounds." But I was discussing the assent due to Roman decrees precisely as such, and did not wish to obscure the issue.

(6) As Dr. Cartmell expressly allows that "if St. Thomas really has quite grave reasons for doubting the truth of a given decision, then he may suspend his judgment," and that "for the fixing of our attitude in individual cases, we must not forget that the binding force varies, as Wilmers says, with the 'momenta'," I do not think there is really much divergence of view between us on the main issue.

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM.

